Pages 1 - 171

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER, JUDGE, JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.) No. CR 16-00462 CRB 1

SUSHOVAN TAREQUE HUSSAIN,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Monday, February 5, 2018

TRANSCRIPT OF JURY SELECTION PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: ALEX G. TSE

Acting United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor San Francisco, California 94102

BY: ADAM REEVES

ROBERT LEACH WILLIAM FRENTZEN

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For Defendant: KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP

633 Battery Street

San Francisco, California 94111-1809

BY: JOHN W. KEKER, ESQ.

JAN NIELSEN LITTLE, ESQ.

BROOK DOOLEY, ESQ CODY GRAY, ESQ. IAN KANIG, ESQ. NIC MARAIS, ESQ.

Also Present: SUSAN D. RESLEY, ESQ.

Morgan Lewis

Reported By: BELLE BALL, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR

Official Reporter, U.S. District Court

Monday - February 5, 2018

9:25 a.m.

PROCEEDINGS

(The following proceedings were held in open court, outside the presence and hearing of the jury venire)

THE COURT: Would the parties please identify themselves.

MR. LEACH: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Leach for the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. KEKER: Good morning, Your Honor. John Keker for Mr. Hussain, who is present in court.

THE COURT: Right. Good morning.

So, I just asked a question, that we're starting jury selection today. In the event that it does not appear by the numbers that we have a sufficient number to exercise all the peremptory challenges and to select a jury, we won't exercise any peremptory challenges. We will wait until -- we'll bring in additional people on the 22nd. Because I don't think parties should have to exercise a peremptory challenge unless they see the whole thing.

I mean, you know, life is choices, and this is one of the choices that you need to look at everybody, and then decide A is better than B if you are going to exercise a challenge.

So that's just where we are. And I can see that we already have some problem because now it's 9:30 and nobody's here.

I don't want to say nobody is here.

```
Everybody's here except 87, 88 and 90,
 1
          MR. KEKER:
 2
      apparently.
          THE COURT:
                     Yeah.
 3
          MR. KEKER: I'm optimistic. We tried to count the hardships
 4
 5
      and count the causes.
          THE COURT: I don't do anything to discourage them from
 6
      service.
 7
          MR. KEKER: Yeah, well, some --
 8
          THE COURT: Well, then, maybe we can. Listen, I would be
 9
      delighted if we can.
10
          MR. KEKER: We're optimistic, based on what we saw in the
11
      questionnaires.
12
13
          THE COURT: All right.
          MR. KEKER: But we'll see.
14
15
          MR. LEACH: We're willing to try --
16
          THE COURT: You'll do what Vincent Hallinan did -- I watched
17
      him do this. I don't know whether you ever saw -- did you ever
18
      see him pick a jury?
          MR. FRENTZEN: I have heard the stories, but I haven't seen
19
      it.
20
          THE COURT: It's great. I watched him. The jury just
21
      said -- looked, he said, and you know, the prosecution went
22
      through this, and that, and -- "And Mr. Hallinan, it's your
23
      turn."
24
          He says: "Anybody, raise your hand if you can't give my
25
```

client a fair trial. No hands, I'll take them." 1 And that was the voir dire. 2 I don't think we are going to get that far. MR. KEKER: 3 THE COURT: You probably would not do that. 4 5 MR. KEKER: But it sounds great. THE COURT: It sounds great, yeah. Those stories always 6 sound great. 7 All right, so, let's just wait until everybody comes in. 8 think we're going to, you know, fill this, fill that and, and --9 are those people prospective jurors out there? 10 11 MR. KEKER: Well --THE COURT: Do you want any of those? 12 MR. KEKER: Well, we would really be in good shape. They're 13 from our office. 14 THE COURT: You never know. Don't be too confident of that. 15 16 MR. KEKER: I think -- most of them I think would be good 17 jurors. 18 (Laughter) I thought, then, I would go through the motions 19 THE COURT: in limine. And then we have sort of a whole series of where are 20 we on other issues that we have raised. So I'm prepared to do 21 22 that after we do the jury. That's fine with the government, Your Honor. 23 MR. LEACH: THE COURT: Okay? All right. Okay. Well, I have run out 24 of things to say, so I'll just leave. 25

```
(A pause in the proceedings)
 1
          THE CLERK: Calling CR 16-0462, USA versus Sushovan Tareque
 2
      Hussain.
 3
          Counsel, please state your appearances
 4
 5
          MR. LEACH:
                     Good morning, Your Honor, Robert Leach, Adam
      Reeves and Will Frentzen for the United States.
 6
 7
          THE COURT: Good morning.
          MR. KEKER: Good morning, Your Honor. John Keker, Jan
 8
      Little and Brook Dooley for Sushovan Hussain, who is present in
 9
      court.
10
11
          THE COURT:
                     Good morning. So, let's bring in the jury
12
      panel.
13
          Is it the number, how are they arranged?
                     They're still in the same order.
14
          THE CLERK:
          THE COURT:
                     They all showed up?
15
16
          (Off-the-Record discussion between the Court and Clerk)
                     Your Honor, we all made charts based on this.
17
          MR. KEKER:
      If we can just leave some of the chairs, the ones who didn't
18
      show up, if we can just leave the chair empty, because if we
19
      start --
20
          THE COURT: No, no, no, we can't do it that way. Because we
21
      -- we figured out some other way to do it.
22
23
          But we'll tell you, you'll hear the name, what --
          THE CLERK: For example, 9 is not here, so 10 is in its
24
25
              That's the only one out of the chairs that they're going
```

to --1 THE COURT: Yeah, because we are always going to have spaces 2 out there, too, so it's not going to work. Even if we left a 3 space -- what I'm saying is even if we left a space, you 4 5 wouldn't be able to tell out there. THE CLERK: Right. 6 THE COURT: 7 And they're all in that order. MR. KEKER: Except we have got them all written down, we 8 know the person that is sitting there, we know the number, and 9 we can find it. 10 11 THE COURT: You won't know the number, like, next to that person, if we have missed a number. 12 13 MR. KEKER: We do because we have set it up that way. if somebody is sitting out there (Indicating) with a number and 14 15 isn't -- here. 16 THE COURT: They don't have numbers out there. 17 MR. KEKER: They do. All of these are numbered. THE COURT: They do? 18 You've got four rows, you've got everybody 19 MR. KEKER: numbered here. 20 THE COURT: You know this system better than I do. 21 MR. KEKER: And we have set it up so that we know the person 22 23 sitting back there in the corner is number such and such. She's in charge. What do you want do? 24 THE COURT: 25 THE CLERK: The numbers have been removed, but however you

```
do your paperwork, that's fine.
 1
          THE COURT: Okay. You'll adjust.
 2
         THE CLERK:
                     Right.
 3
          THE COURT: And if there's a problem, if there's a problem
 4
 5
     we'll just take some extra time. That is not a problem. Okay.
     All right.
 6
 7
          THE CLERK: Okay.
          THE COURT: Go ahead, let them in.
 8
          (Jury venire enters the courtroom)
 9
          THE CLERK: Todd Allen Flournoy. Juror No. 1, please step
10
      forward.
11
          Jackelyn Morales?
12
13
          THE COURT: Lashanda, why don't you take the microphone.
          THE CLERK: Okay.
14
15
         THE COURT: The hand-held microphone.
16
         Have a seat, No. 1, Mr. Flournoy. You may come forward.
17
         THE CLERK: Charles Chung Ho, No. 3. Somsack Sayborivong,
      4. Terrence Eugene Higgins, 5. Keith D. Weiner, 6. Stephanie
18
     Michelle Jameson, 7. Anien Yip, 8.
19
          Evelia Lampitoc Gagan is excused. Priya Kaul, 10. Olivia
20
     Kelli Wong, 11. Kenneth Matthew Hall, 12. John Michael Yencer,
21
22
      13. Chunlei Mei, 14. Tensy A. Botto, 15. Kenneth Roy
23
     Knowlton, 16. Lefkos Byron Aftonomos, 17.
          Cynthia Lasandra Gill, 18. Jan Lee Ross, 19. Richard
24
25
     Walton (sic) Schumann, 20. Deborah C. Garcia, 21. Noemy
```

```
Guadalupe Floresjovel, 22. John Mulligan, 23, excused. Raymond
 1
 2
     Mitsuo Aoki, 24.
         Thomas E. Johnston, 25. Kes Poopat, 26. Danae Dion
 3
     Cranley, 27. Craig Lawrence Rowland, 28. Kirsten Noelle Craig,
 4
 5
      29. Keelyn E. Nori, 30. Galina Gorbatok, 31, excused. Chris
     Antaki, 32. Lucarda Barr, 33.
 6
         Richard E. Middleton, 34. Vincent Edward O'Brien, 35.
 7
      Scott M. Woebcke, 36. John Walter Pressley, 37. Julian Mapes
 8
     Lopez-Morillas, 38. Donald Edwin Roberts, 39, excused. Steven
 9
     Alan Maganazook, 40.
10
11
         Jean Rullamas, 41. Timothy Logan Conroy, 42. Beth Ann
     Fenwick, 43. Karen Brosseau Shay, 44. Yana Kiziryan, 45.
12
     Candace Ann Plevyak, 46. John Reisinger, 47. Paul Martin
13
     Walker, 48. Hector Pinson Palada, 49.
14
15
         Peter Yip, excused, 50. Ida Koh Branting, excused. 51.
16
     Marc Justin Wong, 52. Alice Claire Combs, 53. Becky Ling, 54.
17
     Patrick L. McClellon, 55. William H. McAbee -- I'm sorry.
18
     Thank you. 56.
         Gil Pornela Seastres, excused, 57. Winston Don Moy, 58.
19
      Sualen Anita Murphy, 59, excused. Maria F. --
20
21
         THE COURT: I'm sorry, was 59 excused?
22
         THE CLERK:
                    Yes.
23
         THE COURT: Thank you.
```

THE CLERK: Maria F. Carmona Rios, 60. Quinn -- Quinn

Maxwell Stallcup, 61. Eric Alan Naeseth, 62. Christopher

24

```
Michael Angel, 63. Jon David Pevna, 64.
 1
         Dan Doveralba, 65. Ronald Martin Miller, 66. Joseph
 2
     Nicholas Hutka, 67. Remy Medina Encarnacio, 68. Yumiko Jayme
 3
     Maeda, 69.
 4
 5
         Jeffrey Brian French, excused, 70. Geneva An Dang, excused,
      71. Mariechris Kiara Resplandor, 72. Camille -- Patricia
 6
     Camille Lax Palo, 73. Laura Ashley Combs, 74. Shamal Mccord
 7
      Stegeman, 75. Michael Hernandez Soto, 76.
 8
         Derek James Cochran, 77, excused. Markham Brock Miller, 78.
 9
     Richard Wegener Beaty, 79. Karen E. Bonilla, 80. Gustavo
10
11
     Munguia, 81. Delton Ray Edwards, excused, 82.
         Pierantonio Cendron, 83. Tsering Doma Sangpo, 84. Marjorie
12
     Diane Drake, 85. Shivkumar Ramaswamy, 86. Graciela Guevara,
13
      87. Mirna Scheffy --
14
15
         THE COURT: Frederick Streitz?
16
         THE CLERK: Not here. 88, Frederick Streitz, not here.
17
     Mirna Scheffy, 89. Edward Wong, 90, not here.
18
         THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Would you administer the oath
     to the panel.
19
20
         THE CLERK: Welcome to the courtroom of the Honorable
     Charles R. Breyer. Please stand and raise your right hand.
21
          (Jury venire placed under oath)
22
23
         THE COURT: Call the case.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: (Inaudible)

THE CLERK: Do you so affirm?

24

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: That I don't believe in God?
 1
          THE COURT: No, all you have to do is say you affirm that
 2
     you will tell the truth.
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Separation of state and
 4
 5
     religion.
          THE COURT: I'm sorry, I don't know who is speaking. I'm
 6
     hearing a voice.
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Juror 36.
 8
          THE COURT: Sorry?
 9
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: No. 36. You are asking me to
10
     take the oath with the context of God.
11
          THE COURT: No. You don't have to.
12
13
         All you have to do is --
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Correct, but she used the word
14
15
      "God." So --
16
         THE COURT: I understand --
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: So do we have a separation of
17
      church and state here or not?
18
          THE COURT: Let me see if this satisfies you. You don't
19
     have to. If you don't want to do it, you don't have to do it.
20
21
     But will you promise to tell the truth?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Yes, absolutely.
22
23
          THE COURT: Thank you. Okay.
          THE CLERK: Your Honor, there are 76 jurors present.
24
          THE COURT: Great. Okay. Will you call the case now.
25
```

THE CLERK: Calling Criminal Action CR-16-0462, USA versus Sushovan Tareque Hussain.

MR. LEACH: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Leach for the United States. And here with my colleagues, William Frentzen, Adam Reeves, Beth Margen, and FBI Special Agent Alexandra Bryant.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KEKER: Good morning, Your Honor. John Keker. And I'm here with my law partners Jan Little and Brook Dooley. And most importantly, I'm here with our client, Sushovan Hussain.

Sushovan, stand up, please.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KEKER: Good morning.

THE COURT: Well, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I think you probably were here a bit earlier than right now and it's taken us a bit of time to get organized but the organization I hope will make this, the proceedings today go faster.

I think you all heard me or you should have when I spoke to you last week. I think it was Thursday, not quite sure, but I think it was Thursday before, you filled out a questionnaire.

And I don't want repeat myself, though I have a tendency to repeat myself. But we are now under way in this process of picking a jury.

Again, I want to stress a couple of things to you before we

start asking questions. First, of course, and most importantly, I want to thank you. This is a sacrifice on your part. It's a sacrifice to you, perhaps to your employment, your friends, your family, your obligations. And we wouldn't ask you to do this unless it was really important.

And I want you to know how important we consider it, the parties consider it to be, and how essential it is to the administration of justice in this system. So what you are embarking upon is not a trivial matter. It is a matter that -- that is of great concern to the proper functioning of this country in a manner in which the founders of the Constitution believed to be of essential importance.

So I do want to stress that. I want to also do it in the context that jury service, while it is service, is -- is so important that we want to make sure that anybody who serves in this case can be fair. And when I say "fair," I mean fair to both sides. Fair to the government, and fair to the defense.

Now, we are about to ask you a series of questions. And believe me, you have already answered quite a few questions.

The -- the design of the questions is to see whether or not in this particular case -- not every case, this particular case -- you could render a fair verdict.

So you might think: Well, I've read something about the case. Or: I have some opinion about the case. Or: I have some opinion about the law in the case. Any of these things.

And I will emphasize the fact that a perfect jury, if there is such thing, is not a jury that has not had life experiences, is not a jury that does not have opinions, is not a jury that hasn't taken positions on individual -- on issues and so forth. It is a jury which is committed to listening to what is the evidence in this case, and then, what is the law in this case. And applying the law to the facts of the case, and making a determination whether or not the government has proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt, as to the guilt or innocence of a defendant.

And that really is the -- the test that we're going to use in determining whether or not you can sit here for some considerable period of time.

We estimate that the case will be over, I think we said, what, mid-April, right? Something like that.

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: And we're not going to start until the end of the month. But we need to know that you can be here every day, that you can be here on time, that you can, when you are here, listen to the evidence, and at the conclusion, return a verdict or attempt to return a verdict in this case. So we need your efforts in order to accomplish this task.

Now, saying all that, I want to just give you a couple of, sort of, ideas that perhaps may be of concern to you, but ought not to be.

Let me start out with the big concern which people say, is:
Well, you know, I don't want to have to adjudicate a punishment.
I have strong feelings about penalties, and I don't want to have to weigh in on that.

And the answer is: That's true, you don't. Your job is not to determine what is suitable in terms of punishment. Your job is to determine what are the facts in this case. They may or may not warrant punishment. That's up to the Court to determine after you have arrived at a verdict. So you can put that out of your mind. That's not a consideration.

A second thing is: Well, gee, you know, I don't know that I can sit here through all of this. You know, my back hurts. I need fresh air. I don't know whether it will be sort of too intense.

And what I say to that is a couple of things. Number one, we do take recesses in the morning, recess in the afternoon, we take a short lunch hour and we move quickly. Because these lawyers know -- and they are so good -- that we have issues that we have to decide as to what you should hear, what are the limits and so forth, what are the areas. We decide all of that outside your presence at a time when you are not even here.

And so when you are here, you will be not stuck in that jury room. You will actually be out here in this courtroom, listening to evidence. And we move rather quickly through a case because we know we are taking your time, and that's a

valuable commodity. So we will move as quickly as possible.

So, I'm going to start -- I think each one of you have been handed a piece of paper, is that right? And it's sort of a little script. I want you to understand that all the parties have had the opportunity of reading through your questionnaire so they have a sense of what your answers will be to the questions that they asked. And I am going to first go through, asking all of you to answer the questions, one at a time.

Something may come up that requires some further discussion.

I'll be glad to engage you in that exercise. And then we have -- the parties have the opportunity to ask you some question, themselves.

So, there's no -- you know, as they say, a great journey begins one step at a time. So, let's take the first step with you, Mr. Flournoy, I don't know whether you're in the cat bird seat or not but you are number one on our list. So if you would answer the questions. Please, do so.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: Okay. Todd Allen Flournoy. I
live in Orinda. I have lived in California all 39 years of my
life.

I am an intern teacher for the seventh grade. I am married.

My wife is a public accountant. I have three children. Seven,

2, and three months.

I have never served in the military. And never served on a jury. And I can be fair to both sides in this case.

```
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Flournoy. Hand the microphone to
 1
     Ms. Morales.
 2
         And if I mispronounce your name correct me.
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORALES: Thank you. My name is Jackelyn
 4
 5
     Morales. And I lived in Hercules for 15 years but before that I
     lived in San Francisco. I'm in Daly City. And I live in
 6
     California for 33 years, all my life. And I'm a licensed
 7
     vocational nurse.
 8
         And I am married, and my husband, he does -- he's a
 9
     registered nurse. And I do have one child and he's three years
10
11
     old. And I never served in the military. And I, um, never
12
      served on a jury.
         And on this case I can be fair on both sides.
13
14
         THE COURT: Thank you.
15
         Mr. Chung.
16
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: Mr. Ho.
17
         THE COURT:
                    Pardon me?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: Last name is Ho.
18
         THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you for correcting me.
19
     Mr. Ho.
20
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: I'm Charles Chung Ho. I live in San
22
     Leandro. Lived there for about 18 years. I am a construction
23
     project manager.
          I am married. And my wife is a financial analyst. I have a
24
```

12-year-old son. I have never served in the military.

I was on a jury before. It was a criminal case. And there was a verdict.

I can be fair to both sides of the case.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ho. Let me ask you a question because now you raised an interesting issue. Your wife's employment is as a financial analyst.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: Yeah.

THE COURT: Is she self-employed or does she work for a company?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: Yes, she works at Kaiser Permanente.

THE COURT: Kaiser Permanente. And I'm not quite sure I know, if you can elaborate a little bit about what you mean by "financial analyst." Does she do bookkeeping in the sense that she works in records or what?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: Yes. She is also in the same division as I am in Kaiser. I work for Kaiser. She -- I handle construction so there is a lot of budgets going on and she is the financial analyst, analyzes the cash flows and where the funding's coming from, and make sure it's spent correctly.

THE COURT: Now in this case -- and we always have to talk about because, you know, each case is different -- in this case, there will be a fair amount of information and testimony about financial transactions. And about bookkeeping or accounting or how do you -- how do you look at certain figures, how do you understand them. What do they mean. Things that I would guess

your wife has some expertise, and you might as well.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: Correct.

THE COURT: So the question is, given that -- two things.

Number one, let's do the first one first, which is: You understand that whatever your expertise, whatever your understanding is, you have to listen to what the witnesses say and evaluate the witnesses, not necessarily bring in your own specialized training in accounting.

Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: I understand.

THE COURT: Okay, and do you further understand that no matter how fascinating you find all of this information to be by the brilliant presentation of it by both sides, you are not to go home and discuss with it your wife?

Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: I understand.

THE COURT: Yeah, sometimes it is very useful to be able to say: Don't discuss what you have done during the day with your spouse, partner, whatever. And, but it's a serious matter in particular where your wife may have some expertise with the very subject matter that we're going to be addressing in this court.

Is that all right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: That's all right.

THE COURT: You don't have any problem saying: The judge told me I can't talk about it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HO: I have no problem. 1 THE COURT: Okay, all right. Thank you very much, Mr. Ho. 2 Mr. Sayborivong. Yes. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: My name is Somsack 4 5 Sayborivong. I live in Concord, California, for over 28 years. I lived in California, same, over 28 years. I'm retired from 6 computer technician. 7 I am single. I have not served in the military service. I 8 never serve in jury service and I can be fair for both sides. 9 THE COURT: Let me ask you, because obviously English is not 10 11 your first language. Is that right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: That's correct. 12 13 THE COURT: But you seem to be conversant in English, is that fair to say? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: I don't really understand, 15 16 what's that? 17 THE COURT: Well, that's going to be my question. I want to find out whether you are able to understand -- whether your 18 level of understanding of the English language, what -- how do 19 you assess it? Where do you place it? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: My daily life I'm okay, but 21 in term of law vocabulary or scientific work, I have a problem 22 -- I have a hard time to understand that. 23 THE COURT: Have you actually studied English outside the 24 United States? 25

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Yes, from my country.
 1
          THE COURT: And how many years of English did you take?
 2
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Two years.
 3
          THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any difficulty understanding
 4
      my questions to you?
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Yes, sir.
 6
 7
          THE COURT: You do have some difficulty.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Yes, sir.
 8
          THE COURT: Okay. Do you feel -- if you are selected as a
 9
      juror, one of the requirements for a juror is to be willing to
10
11
      discuss his or her views with the other jurors.
          Now, do you feel your English is good enough or it's not
12
      good enough to engage in these discussions?
13
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Your Honor, like I said, if
14
      the word that they use in law or scientific, I'm hard time to
15
16
      understand that too.
17
          THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, we will leave it at
      that.
18
          I will only say to all of you, there will be in the course
19
      of this trial sometimes terms that are very technical.
20
      hopefully will be simple enough, but who knows whether it's
21
      simple enough. Judges are supposed to make it understandable.
22
23
      Who knows? I'll try.
          But you don't need to have -- I think what I'm trying to say
24
      is you don't need to have any expertise in the law. You don't
25
```

need to have any expertise in accounting. That's not necessary. We will try, and I'm sure the lawyers will, to make terms as clear as possible to the jurors. Their job is to convince you of their position. And the only way they can do that is to make things as clear as possible to you. You are the audience. Not me. You're the audience. So it is their task to make things clear. We hope they will.

And I'm going to -- and the parties may ask you some further questions about your English. Thank you very much. And will you pass it on to Mr. Higgins.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HIGGINS: Thank you.

My name is Terrence Higgins. I live in Berkeley; I have been there for two years and two months. I have spent my entire life in California, where I was born. I'm a mental health counselor in private practice.

But if I were selected for the jury, I would no longer probably be in practice because I would see my entire caseload migrate to other practitioners. So I need to state that that's a thing that's going on in my mind.

I'm married. My wife is a consultant to individuals in small companies. I have no children. I have not been in the military.

I have been on two juries in the past. One civil, one criminal. One reached a verdict, the other did not. I could be fair to both sides.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 (Reporter interruption) PROSPECTIVE JUROR HIGGINS: Two years, two months. 3 THE COURT: You lived elsewhere. 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HIGGINS: THE COURT: Because you have been in the Bay area. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HIGGINS: I have been in the Bay area 7 pretty much my entire life, with two expatriate periods, one in 8 Mexico, one in Indonesia, about three months each. And prior to 9 living in Berkeley, I lived in Marin County. And prior to that 10 11 I was a San Francisco resident for 30 years. Born and raised in the East Bay prior to that. 12 13 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Higgins. Mr. Weiner? 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: Hi, my name is Keith Weiner. live in Half Moon Bay, California. I have been there for about 16 17 three and a half years. Prior to that I have been in California 18 for 36 years. I'm a building inspector. I am married. My wife is a 19 20 director for clinical trials for a pharma company. I have two 21 stepchildren. They will be 14 and 16 this month. 22 I'm prior Air Force. I was a mechanic on airplanes the entire time I was in the service. 23 I have never been on a jury before. And I could be fair to 24

both sides.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Jameson.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR JAMESON: My name is Stephanie Jameson. I live in Concord, and I have lived there for two years, and I recently moved to California. I have only been living in California for two years. I moved here from the East Coast.

I'm a consulting utility forester. I am single. I have never been in the military or served as a jury.

And no, I don't think I can be fair to both sides. I think that the stress and anxiety, that all of the personal financial hardships this is going to cause me, with eight weeks of serving as a juror, is not going to make me be able to listen fairly to both sides of the case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Jameson.

And we'll bring it down to Ms. Yip.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR YIP: Hi, my name is Anien Yip. And I live in Alameda. And I have been there for ten years. I lived in California for 40 years. Minus the five years that I lived in Colorado, from 2005 to 2009.

My occupation is an accountant. I am married. And my husband is a personal trainer.

I have two kids and they are 12 and 10 years old. I have not served in the military service before. And I never served in a jury. And I could be fair to both side of this case.

However, in 2007, the company that I worked for was acquired

```
by Hewlett-Packard. And in 2009, I was laid off. And I felt a
 1
      little bit bitter about being laid off by Hewlett-Packard.
 2
     Because I feel like they just acquired, um, just the competition
 3
      and didn't care about the people. So, that's it.
 4
 5
          THE COURT:
                    And do you -- does that feeling persist today?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR YIP: Kind of. Because after that, I was
 6
 7
      acquired -- acquisitions that I feel strongly about.
          THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Ms. Yip.
 8
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: My name is Priya Kaul.
                                                           I am a
 9
      resident of San Francisco and I have lived there for about two
10
11
     years. I have lived in California for on and off, 20 years.
12
      am an attorney.
13
          I am unmarried, do not have children. Have not served in
     the military or on a jury. And can be fair to both sides.
14
15
          THE COURT: An attorney.
16
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes, Your Honor.
17
         THE COURT: There are a few out here.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: I noticed.
18
                     There are guite a few in the back.
19
          THE COURT:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: I noticed that too.
20
          THE COURT: All right, so let's talk about your legal
21
              Are you associated with a law firm?
22
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes. Gibson Dunn & Crutcher.
23
          THE COURT: Gibson Dunn & Crutcher, I have a heard of them.
24
     And they are a Los Angeles law firm with an office here?
25
```

I work in the San Francisco 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes. office. 2 And how long have you been associated with them? THE COURT: 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: A little over two years. 4 5 THE COURT: And have you formed a specialty? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: 6 THE COURT: Okay, what type of work do you do when you go in 7 at 6:00 a.m. in the morning? What's your day like? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: So I work on the litigation side. 9 Haven't worked on any criminal matters, so mostly civil, but 10 11 both plaintiff and defense side. THE COURT: Okay. And do you understand that if you serve 12 13 as a juror, while you are an expert in the law because you are a lawyer, you have to accept the law that the Court gives you as 14 being the law in this case. 15 16 Are you willing to do so? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes. THE COURT: Even if you disagree with it, even when you took 18 the bar, the judge was just wrong on that issue, you know? 19 have -- you could accept it. And even when the Court makes an 20 erroneous evidentiary ruling, you can't sit back there and say: 21 Gee, the judge is wrong, I'm going to come to my own opinion. 22 23 You're willing to accept the Court's view. PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes. 24

THE COURT: Okay. You do that, and I'll try to be right.

Thank you very much.

Ms. Wong.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR O.K. WONG: My name is Olivia Wong. I have lived in San Francisco for the past four years. I have lived in California for a total of ten years. I'm an account management at an advertising agency.

I'm single. No children. Have not served in the military. Have not served as a juror. And I believe I can be fair to both sides in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Hall.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALL: My name is Kenneth Hall. I have lived in Redwood City for the last 15 years. I have lived in California for 51 years. I am an architect.

I am married. My spouse is a community college instructor. We have no children. I have not served in the military or on a jury. And I'm unsure if I can be fair, mainly because of the time impacts on my work commitments. But I'll try.

THE COURT: Well, let's talk about that. One thing I neglected to tell the jurors is that on the average, we will meet four days a week. Not five. And, and sometimes there will be a couple of days in a row that we won't meet. That's because the Court has other commitments that will take -- that I absolutely have to honor because they're professional commitments.

So you will be able to make sure that once a week, at least, you will be able to devote to what other -- other things. But we know it's a sacrifice from everybody, so we really are asking each of you to see whether there's some way you could -- you can make that work for you.

Do you believe you can?

problems. One is, if I could get out two days a week at around 3:00, then I can make my physical therapy sessions.

The second one is I have got signed contracts for designing new houses for people. The time crunch mainly is we need to get building permits by October 15th in order to --

THE COURT: I think we may be able to work around your physical therapy. We'll take a look at that, if you do sit.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALL: Oh great.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Yencer, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: Yes, sir, John Michael Yencer. I live in San Francisco. Probably for the past eleven years. I have lived in California all my life which has been about 45 years.

I am married. My wife does billing and coding for UCSF, electrophysiology. And we have two children. They're ten and four.

And no military service, I have never served on a jury, and

I think I can be fair to both sides on this case. 1 But unfortunately I do have a financial hardship issue as well. 2 What is the nature of the financial hardship? THE COURT: 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: I only get paid for four weeks 4 5 through my employer, and if it goes over that, I don't get paid at all for the last, you know, number of weeks that we are 6 serving. 7 And also my daughter's starting preschool in March and 8 that's an additional financial hardship as well. 9 THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you very much. 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: Thank you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Hi, my name is Chunlei Mei. I live 12 in San Francisco and almost 14 years, lived in California. 13 a saleslady in Macy's. And I'm married. 14 And also my husband is a salesman. And we don't have any 15 16 children. And never served in military before and also I never 17 served in jury before. I will be fair to both side in this case. 18 THE COURT: 19 Thank you. 20 Ms. Botto. 21

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BOTTO: Hello, my name is Tensy Botto. I live in Sausalito, Marin County. I lived there for nine years.

And my -- I'm unemployed. My previous occupation was bookkeeper at a financial institution.

22

23

24

25

I'm single. I have two children, the age of 20 and 13, and

Case 3:16-cr-00462-CRB Document 248 Filed 02/23/18 Page 29 of 172 one on the way. And I don't have any previous military service. 1 And I have not served in a jury. And I can be fair for both 2 sides. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. Okay, would you bring the microphone 4 to Mr. Knowlton. 5 I'm sorry; there is a hand. Yes, what is your name? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPLANDOR: Your Honor, I was wondering 7 if I can be excused to go to the ladies' room. 8 THE COURT: Oh, yes. Certainly. Yeah. All right. Sorry 9 we have to go through this process but -- we are going to take a 10 11 break shortly. So, let's -- we will probably just go through to the end of this. 12

Go ahead.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: My name is Kenny Knowlton. I live in Sebastopol. I have lived in my current residence for four years. I have lived in Sebastopol basically my whole life. So I have lived in California my whole life. I'm a high-school physical education teacher and athletic director.

I'm married. My wife is a marketing director for Redwood
Credit Union. I have two small children, ages 5 and 6. I have
never served in the military. I have never served on a jury.
And I believe I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: Now, okay, you have raised the issue of the commute.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: Yeah.

```
THE COURT: Is that right? So obviously it is a commute
 1
      from Sebastopol. If we start at 9:00 --
 2
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: Which makes it even worse
 3
     because traffic gets worse.
 4
 5
          THE COURT: It's worse.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: Yeah.
 6
 7
         THE COURT: You are not suggesting we start at 7:00.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: It would make my commute
 8
      easier.
 9
          THE COURT: Your commute easier and my commute impossible.
10
11
      So I see that is a lengthy commute. We do, again, end at about
      4:00, but then again you are going to hit a commute. So you
12
      foresee a four-hour commute.
13
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: Two hours each way.
14
15
         THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much.
16
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR AFTONOMOS: I am Lefkos Aftonomos.
                                                                I live
17
      in San Francisco and I have been here in California since 1978.
      I'm a semi-retired physician. I'm not married. No children.
18
          I have not been in the military. I have been on two jury,
19
      juries, civil cases. And there were verdicts in both, both
20
21
      times. And I can be fair.
22
          THE COURT: Thank you.
23
         Ms. Gill. Good morning.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR GILL: My name is Cynthia Gill. I live in
24
      San Francisco for 20-plus years. I have lived in California for
25
```

I'm a teacher. 1 62 years. I'm single. No children. No military service. And I have 2 served once as a juror in a criminal case, and it was a partial 3 verdict. And yes, I can be fair on both sides. 4 5 THE COURT: Thank you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: My name is Jan Ross. I live in 6 San Leandro. I have been there for 26 years, California, 62 7 years. I'm an administrative assistant for a food broker. I'm 8 married. My spouse is a cobbler. I have a kid that's 28, he 9 works for City Parks Department and stagehand crew. 10 11 military. I have been on a civil case in the nineties and there was a 12 verdict. And I can be fair on both sides. 13 THE COURT: Okay. You indicated -- did you indicate that 14 you had a friend who worked for Hewlett-Packard? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: A close work friend, her husband. 17 THE COURT: Could you hand the microphone? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: A close work friend, her husband 18 works for Hewlett-Packard. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Now, I don't know whether you have any 20 familiarity with this particular case. Did it --21

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: No.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- ring a bell with you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: Nothing.

THE COURT: Okay and you may -- if you serve as a juror, you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

may be called upon to decide -- you will be called upon to decide an issue. Obviously it may have some impact or it involves in some manner Hewlett-Packard. You understand that. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Now, it may be that you come to a decision that you think is right but may be different from what Hewlett-Packard might want or think is right in any given situation. Does that cause you any discomfort? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: No. THE COURT: And you will agree not to discuss the case with your friend during your jury service. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROSS: Yes. Thank you very much. THE COURT: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: My name is Richard Schumann. live in Sebastopol. Nineteen years. 67 years in California. Retired. Previous occupation was, last one was a courier. Prior to that I was a parts manager. I'm married. My wife is also retired. She -- last -office manager was last position for her with a recycling company. I have four children. The oldest is 40, she is a housewife. Second daughter is 38 and she's a compliance manager for Sutter Then I have a 33-year-old daughter and she is a

records.clerk for Sutter Medical. And then my youngest is 30

and she is a scheduler for Sutter Medical.

No prior military service, have not served on a jury, and I believe I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: So you also have that commute.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: Yeah.

THE COURT: If you two are selected maybe you ought to commute together. You can do that, you know. As long as you don't talk about the case on the way down and on the way back. You have to just talk about events in Sebastopol.

Okay, thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GARCIA: Good morning, name is Deborah

Garcia. I live in Oakland. I have been there for 30 years. I

was born in California. I am an Alameda County Department of

Child Support assistant.

I am married. And my husband is a sales rep, estimator for West Bay Plastics, countertops. And I have two children 29, and he is into animation rigor. And my other son is an assistant manager for Raley's.

And I have not served in the military service and I have not served on a jury service. And I can be fair.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: My name is Noemy

Floresjovel. I live in Rohnert Park, I lived there for the last

14 years. 34 years in California. I am in accounts payable for
a biotech company.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
I am married. My husband is a jacuzzi and spa technician.
I have two daughters. One is 14, in school, eighth grade. And
the older one is a philanthropy coordinator. She's 25.
    I have not served -- been in the military. And I have not
done any jury duty. And yes, I can be fair to both sides.
    THE COURT:
               Thank you.
   Let's go a bit further. Mr. Aoki.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR AOKI: My name is Raymond Aoki. I live in
El Sobrante, California, for 25 years. I have been in
California for 40 years. I'm a retired bartender.
    I'm married. My wife works for airlines. I have a daughter
who's 30, who's in between jobs right now. No military service.
No jury service. And I can be fair for both sides.
   And I requested a -- if I could be excused from this jury
because I'm -- like you, I have plans on my vacation.
    THE COURT: I knew it was a mistake for me to tell -- I told
the jurors, I told the jurors that actually in the next ten days
I do -- I'm taking a vacation.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR AOKI: (Inaudible)
    THE COURT: And I sort of got glimmers of: Oh, well, look
at this, a little irresponsible of the judge to go right off.
   But tell me, you said you got tickets. Are they --
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR AOKI: March 1st.
    THE COURT: I see, okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Aoki.
seat.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR JOHNSTON: My name is Tom Johnston. Live in Pinole, lived in California all but eleven years of our lives. We were eight years in Hawai'i. I was born in Detroit, but we came here when I was three.

I'm a pastor and a teacher. And I teach math and other subjects as a substitute teacher in the district.

Married, happily. That's the status of my marriage. My spouse's occupation, we own a business. She's a floral designer and event coordinator. So, I assist her in that as well.

We have three daughters. 29, she's a marriage and family counselor. 25-year-old who is getting her double doctorate, full ride, from St. Louis University, in bioethics. And I -- our youngest daughter is 21, at UC Irvine, in dramatic arts.

No previous military service. I was on a jury, I was the jury foreman, and we did reach a -- a criminal judgment. And I can be fair to both sides of this case.

THE COURT: Because of your occupation, I would like to ask you this question, but of course, it applies to everybody across the board, which is: A juror, the task of a juror is to be the judge of facts. What are the facts. And then applying the law: Do the facts support a conviction or do they not support a conviction? So you actually have to pass judgment.

And other than the sort of vanilla way to describe it in terms of passing facts -- obviously it is passing judgment on another person's conduct. I mean ultimately, that's what it is.

1 At least in part. So sometimes people in your profession and others feel 2 uncomfortable about passing judgment on another person. 3 indirectly, in terms of -- in terms of a verdict. 4 5 My question to you is: Are you able to do so? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR JOHNSTON:** Yes, I am. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Johnston. PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: My name is Kes Poopat. I live in 8 Brentwood for nine years. I have been in California for 32 9 years. I'm a branch manager at a bank. 10 11 Unmarried. I have a 26-year-old daughter who is a full-time 12 student at graduate school. 13 No to No. 8, no to No. 9. And I'll do my best. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 (Reporter interruption) 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRANLEY: My name is Danae Cranley, and I 17 live in Berkeley. And we have been there for five years. I have been in California for 40 years. I am employed as an 18 employee benefits account manager. 19 I'm married. My husband works for a startup in Oakland. 20 have three children, ages 9, 6 and 6. I have not been in the 21

I'm married. My husband works for a startup in Oakland. I have three children, ages 9, 6 and 6. I have not been in the military. I have not been on a jury. And I believe I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: Thank you.

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: My name is Craig Rowland. I

also live in Sebastopol, California. I have lived in California for over 60 years. I'm a certified official for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Generally, GI Bill payments for the veterans at Santa Rosa Junior College.

I'm divorced. I have two children. My son is an electrical engineer in Oregon and my daughter is a certified state welder up in Chico.

I have 16 years military service. I served in the United States Army. I was a combat engineer and paratrooper.

I have been called to jury duty seven times and I have been recused seven times, so I have never served on a jury. I can be fair to both sides. But I know myself, and it is a two-hour commute each way. And if I get mad, after a certain period of time, I'm just going to be a thumbs down.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRAIG: All righty. I'm Kirsten Craig. I live in San Francisco and I have lived here for about three years. I have lived in California for 25 years.

I'm a partner marketing manager at Sales Force. I'm single;
I do not have children. I have not served in the military and I
have not served in jury service.

I'm not sure I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: And what is your concern about being fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRAIG: I have a few different connections
to HP, and I'm familiar with this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NORI: My name is Keelyn Nori. I live in San Francisco, and I have been there for about seven years. I have lived in California for the same. My occupation is a -- an engineer at a large semiconductor company.

I am married. My husband is -- he works as a software engineer for a small tech company. I have no children. I have not served in the military. I have not served on a jury previously.

I think I'm going to have trouble being fair because I -missing that much work. I work for a small group that does
things for the whole company, and it's just going to -- I am
going to have some anxiety problems. If I get bored, I might
think about work.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANTAKI: My name is Chris Antaki. I have lived in San Francisco for the last 14 months. Lived in California for about 30 years. I'm a software engineer.

Single. No children. No military service. No previous jury service. And I could definitely be -- I'll definitely try to be fair to both sides in the case.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Antaki.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANTAKI: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Yeah, you raised some concerns about United Kingdom and some of their policies.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANTAKI: (Nods head)

THE COURT: Which raises a question to me for all jurors.

You understand that the defendant in this case, I assume, is not an American citizen, though I don't know whether he is or not.

Is that correct?

MR. KEKER: He is an English citizen, Your Honor. Emigrated there from Bangladesh.

THE COURT: Okay, so he is an English citizen emigrated to the United Kingdom from Bangladesh. So obviously if anybody has any feelings at all towards citizens from the United Kingdom, individuals who are born and raised in Bangladesh, such feelings, if they would at all influence in any way, your decision, it's important for us to know that. Okay. It's important for us to know that.

So now we have those out there on the table, be sure to tell us if that's the case.

But turning back to you, sir, does that create any problems for you? Or issues?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANTAKI: I mean, there might be a small
impact. I'm not -- I think that the UK definitely has some
policies I don't agree with. And the fact that the people
allowed those to become a law, like, kind of concerns me. But I don't know if that -- I don't know how he voted, so --

THE COURT: And, unlikely to find out. The -- the fact is that anybody who is from a foreign country or in the United

States may have disagreements with the policies or the government of the United States with a foreign country. But the -- you know, we don't have a country on trial. We have an individual on trial. And that individual, wherever that individual's from, is entitled to the full protections of the Constitution of the United States.

And so to -- the law that will be applied here in this case, even though it involves an individual who is not an American citizen, will be the same as if he were an American citizen.

He's entitled to all of those protections as all the rest of us are.

So would you have any hesitation giving the defendant in this case the full protections of the United States

Constitution?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANTAKI: That seems fair.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BARR: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Lucarda Barr. I live in San Bruno, California and have lived there for 35 years. I lived in the state of California for 67 years. I'm a retired administrative admin from San Francisco Unified School District.

I have been married over 40 years. My spouse's occupation is a retired tilesetter. I have three children. Two biological. One stepson. Stepson is 43. He's been estranged for guite a few years.

My biological sons, the oldest is 37, works at Fox Marble, heads the tile and marble department. Our youngest is 35, he's a San Francisco fireman.

I have not served in the military. I have not served on jury. And not sure if I can be fair in both side of the case. Simply because there's a lot going on in my life. I presently have a lawsuit, got into a car accident that injured my neck and my back. And my husband's health is extremely compromised. So I don't know if I really can put my full focus and be fair in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: My name is Richard Middleton.

I live in Sebastopol, California --

THE COURT: Oh. We're going to -- we're going to get a bus. I know there's somebody in Rohnert Park. On the way in, we can pick them up too.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: I have lived for over 17 years. Born and raised in California, 54 years. My occupation is a securities financial advisor and compliance officer.

I'm single. I have no children. Served in the military, US Air Force trainee. I have never served on a -- in a trial. And I can be fair.

THE COURT: Now, in this case, we are -- while we are talking about accounting, we are also talking about it in the context of laws which -- which may regulate certain financial

transactions.

And the question I have for you is whether, notwithstanding your experience and your expertise and so forth, you would simply listen to the witnesses, evaluate those witnesses according to a standard that I'm going to put in place, and not rely on your own expertise to come to a conclusion.

Can you do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: Facts and nothing but the facts.

THE COURT: There we go. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'BRIEN: Good morning, Your Honor. My
name is Vincent Edward O'Brien. I live in Greenbrae,
California. I have lived there 39 years.

I have three daughters, ages 44, 41, and 23. The oldest is a schoolteacher in Sacramento. The middle one is a TV producer in Los Angeles and the youngest one is an analyst for Visa here in the city. I'm single. Oh, my occupation is a testifying expert on economic damages. I am single. Said and done that, okay.

And I have, I have two years of ROTC in college but no military service. Never been on a jury. I think I can be fair and impartial to both sides, but the Court needs to understand that I have worked for Mr. Keker and his firm. I have worked for the U.S. Attorney General's office. I have appeared or filed reports opposite the U.S. Attorney General's office. And

I have worked for cases for Hewlett-Packard and opposite 1 Hewlett-Packard. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. O'Brien. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: My name is Scott Woebcke. 4 Ι 5 live in Sonoma, California. I have lived in California for 37 years. 6 I'm a cook by trade, currently unemployed, single, no 7 children. No military experience. I have been summoned to a 8 jury for a criminal trial but didn't have to serve. 9 And as far as being fair on both sides, I don't think it's 10 11 conceivably possible to be fair, given the sheer amount of documents on both sides. I can't see myself being fair without 12 actually being able to physically review everything that they 13 had to come to the conclusion to put this man here on trial. 14 15 So, I mean --16 THE COURT: Well, let me just pursue it just a bit further. 17 There will be a lot of documents. There will be summaries of 18 documents. And the jury will be shown the documents. And during the 19 course of the deliberations, the jury will have all of the 20 evidence available to it. 21 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Yeah, I get that. 23 Not the testimony -- sorry? THE COURT:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: I mean, there's got to be thousands of pages. For me to put someone's life in harm's way,

24

25

```
to be completely unbiased, I mean, I would have to take a really
 1
      huge look. So I don't -- I mean --
 2
          THE COURT:
                     Okay.
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: There's no way I won't --
 4
                     I appreciate that. Thank you very much.
 5
          THE COURT:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR PRESSLEY: Good morning, Your Honor.
                                                                  Му
 6
      name is John Walter Pressley. I live in Pittsburg, California.
 7
      I have been there since 2008. I came here to California in
 8
      1989. I drive a coach bus for some of the tech companies in
 9
      Silicon Valley.
10
          I'm married. My wife worked contract throughout the state,
11
      compensation company. I have no kids.
12
          I served time in the U.S. National Guard Service in Alabama.
13
      I served on one jury which was criminal. I was in the federal
14
15
      witness -- I served as a witness for a federal case.
16
          And because of my hardship, I can try to be fair, but after
17
      three days I don't know, because I only get paid for three days.
18
          THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Pressley.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOPEZ-MORILLAS: Hello, I'm Julian
19
20
      Lopez Morillas. I live in Crockett, been there for eight years.
21
      Lived in California almost 45 years. I'm a stage actor and
      teacher.
22
          I'm married. My wife is an editor, writer, and teacher.
23
      children. No military service. I have never been impaneled on
24
25
      a jury.
```

And I -- I think I can be fair to both sides. 1 THE COURT: Thank you. So, ladies and gentlemen, we're 2 going to take a recess now. And there are two things I want to 3 tell you. First of all, you haven't really heard -- I know you 4 5 haven't heard any evidence in this case. You've heard some remarks by myself and your fellow jurors. But you really don't 6 7 know anything about the case. So I would ask you during the recess not to discuss the case because I don't think you really 8 know anything about the case yet. 9 Secondly, I want you to look to the right and left of you. 10 11 These are your new best friends. And what that means is when you come back into the courtroom make sure you are seated next 12 to your new best friends in the same order that you presently 13 are. And we will be in recess until 11:00. You may leave 14 15 anything you want to on the bench. 16 (Jury venire excused) 17 THE COURT: Can I see all the lawyers at sidebar? We don't need a --18 (Sidebar discussion held off the Record) 19 (Recess taken from 10:50 a.m. to 11:02 a.m.) 20 21 THE COURT: Okay. (The following proceedings were held in the presence of the 22 23 jury venire)

THE COURT: Let the record reflect all parties are present; the panel members are present.

24

25

I think we are starting with Mr. Maganazook? Did I mispronounce your name?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: It's okay. So, Steven

Maganazook. I live in Livermore. I have lived there about two

years. I have lived in California for 32 years. I'm a

researcher at a national laboratory.

I'm married. My wife stays home with my two children, aged 4 and 2. No military service. No previous jury service. I certainly can be fair.

There is a medical condition which would impair that which I would rather discuss in private.

THE COURT: Sorry, didn't hear your last sentence.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: As far as being fair there is a medical condition that would prevent that, which I would rather discuss in private.

THE COURT: We will discuss it in private. Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RULLAMAS: Good morning, Your Honor. My
name is Jean Rullamas. I live in Freemont. Been there about 16
and a half years. I have lived in California for 34 years.

I'm married. My husband is an outside sales manager. We have four kids. One, 18 years old, she's in the food industry as a hostess. I have a 12-year-old, a four-year-old and a 4 year old. Oh, and I have never been in the military.

I have served on two criminal cases. And one we reached a

verdict, and the other one not. And I can be fair to both 1 sides. 2 THE COURT: Thank you. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CONROY: My name is Timothy Conroy. I 4 5 live in Walnut Creek. I've been there for ten years. I've lived in California my whole life, 34 years. I'm a mechanical 6 engineer. 7 I'm married. My wife is self-employed as an event planner. 8 I have two children, they are about to turn six and seven. 9 have no military service. I have never served on a jury. And I 10 believe I can be fair to both sides. 11 12 **THE COURT:** Thank you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR FENWICK: My name is Beth Fenwick. I live 13 in Redwood City. I have been there 23 years. I have lived in 14 15 California all my life. I am a part -- assistant 16 bookkeeper/IT/database maintenance of a small automatic door 17 company. 18 I'm not married. I have no children. Not in the military, not on a jury. And I can be fair to both sides. 19 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 Ms. Shay. MS. SHAY: My name is Karen Shay. I currently live in 22 Sonoma. Been there 18 months. Prior to that I have always 23 lived in California. I'm currently a licensed psychotherapist, 24

25

private practice in Marin County.

I'm married. My husband is an architect and artist. I have one daughter, who's 24. She's in grad school right now. No military service. No jury service. And I believe I can be fair.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PLEVYAK: I'm -- Juror No. 45 is missing,
so I'm No. 46.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PLEVYAK: My name is Candace Plevyak. I live in Livermore. I've been there about 14 years. Been in California for 51 years. I'm a CPA.

I'm married. My husband is a financial advisor. I have three children. The 20-year-old is a student, the 18-year-old is a student, 17-year-old, student. No prior military service. No prior jury service. And I can be fair on both sides.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REISINGER: My name is John Reisinger. My city of residence is Pittsburg. We have been there five years.

I have lived in California all 63 years of my life. I am clerical office support with the FDIC here in San Francisco.

I am very happily married. My wife is on-call office support for the school board in Contra Costa County at various schools. We have no children.

I have not served in the military. I have not had previous jury duty service. And I can be fair to both sides in the case.

THE COURT: Sir, you indicated you had a connection with the FDIC. What is it that you do with respect to them?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REISINGER: I work for RICO USA in clerical office support. And we are subcontracted to the San Francisco Regional Office of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR REISINGER: You are welcome, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WALKER: My name is Paul Walker. I have lived in San Rafael for eight years and California for 44. I'm a product marketer.

I am married. My spouse is a personal trainer. I have no children, no military service or no previous jury service.

While I think I can be fundamentally fair, I do have a family medical hardship I wanted to address. If I may?

THE COURT: Yes. Please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR WALKER: My mother, as indicated in there -- and I included medical records -- has recently been diagnosed as stage 4 lung cancer and I'm her primary family caregiver at this time.

THE COURT: I understand. Thank you very much.

prospective juror palada: My name is Hector Palada. I live in Daly City for more than 30 years. I live in California for more than 40 years. I'm a letter carrier for U.S. Postal Service.

I am married. I have -- my wife is a receptionist. I have two daughters. The older one is 35 years old, is a stay-at-home mom. And the younger one is a doctor assistant who is 30 years old.

I served in the military for three years as a power generation guy. I have no -- I have not served in the jury service before and I can be fair to both sides in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Wong.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR M.J. WONG: Hello, my name is Marc Wong.

I'm currently a resident in Dublin for the past 14 years. I
have lived in California, mainly the Bay area, all my life.

My current occupation is a software programmer for telephony equipment, for a telephony vendor.

I'm currently married. My spouse's occupation is, she's like a data analyst for like business and financial stuff. I do have -- I have a young son and daughter. My son is one year old and my daughter is nine. No occupations right now, so -- I have not served in the military.

I have served as a juror on two juries. One a civil and one a criminal case. And we did come to a verdict.

In regards to being fair, I like to be fair. I just have some hardships in regards to care during the day for my two children because they are young and I am the primary care for them during the day.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I do have some amendments in regards to my questionnaire where I do have some connections to some of the entities listed in this case. THE COURT: Oh, what is the nature of the connections that you have? PROSPECTIVE JUROR M.J. WONG: Mainly, my wife used to work for a company that was acquired by the entity that is --**THE COURT:** By Hewlett-Packard? PROSPECTIVE JUROR M.J. WONG: No, by Autonomy. THE COURT: Autonomy, I see. Okay. Thank you very much. PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: My name is Alice Combs. live in San Francisco. I have lived here for four and a half years, also lived in California for that long. I'm an artist and arts educator. Single, no children. No military, no previous jury service. I can be fair to both sides. THE COURT: Thank you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR LING: My name is Becky Ling. resident of San Mateo, I live there about 20 years and live in San Francisco for ten years. I do have to go back and forth because I do need to take care of my 82-year-old mom. And, I am a fast-food restaurant store manager.

I am single. No kids. No previous military service. I do serve one jury, in San Mateo, it's a criminal. It's not coming to a verdict.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
I don't think I would be fair because of the financial
hardship. And because I am on a fast-pace person. So I -- I
will not slow down, which is -- make mistakes in here. And
English is not my first language so I don't think I would be
fair.
    Thank you.
    THE COURT:
              Thank you.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: My name is Patrick McClellon.
I have lived here in San Francisco for 18 years and lived in
California for 18 years. I'm a software engineer for Charles
Schwab.
    I'm single. No military service. Never served on a jury.
I think I could be fair.
    THE COURT: Thank you.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR McABEE: My name is William McAbee.
have lived in San Mateo, California, and California all my life,
69 years. My occupation, I'm a retired auto technician.
    I'm married. My wife is a paralegal. I have two adult
children. One 45, and one 47. And they're both in child care.
No military service. Was on a jury, a criminal jury trial once.
And there was a verdict. And I can be fair.
    THE COURT: Mr. McAbee, you indicated your wife is a
paralegal? Pardon me.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR McABEE: Yes.
    THE COURT: And is she -- is she associated with a law firm
```

or a company that uses her services?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR McABEE: She does contract work at home, like research and stuff for the Appellate Court and ACLU and different --

THE COURT: Okay. But she's not associated with any law firm that's involved in this particular case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR McABEE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: My name is Winston Moy. I live in Berkeley, California. I have lived there about 35 years. I have been in California about the same amount of time. I'm federal employee. I'm a grant administrator with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I'm single. I have no children. I have not served in the military. I've served on four juries, two in Alameda County, one criminal where we had a verdict. A civil where we did not. It was settled before. And two civil cases where there were verdicts in Multnomah County, Oregon.

And, can I be fair? I would like to think that I can be fair. However, I am an HP stockholder.

THE COURT: Well, okay. First of all, Hewlett-Packard is not a party to this case. I appreciate the fact that you are -- indicated you are a stockholder. But I don't know -- I'll have to give some thought as to whether or not that is a reason for disqualification. Might be, might not. I don't know yet. I'll

```
have to hear from the parties.
 1
          But thank you very much. Other than that, you feel you
 2
      could be fair.
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Yes, yes.
 4
 5
          THE COURT: Do you know anybody at Hewlett-Packard?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY:
 6
 7
          THE COURT: Do you have any relationship with
      Hewlett-Packard other than being one of --
 8
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY:
                                  No.
 9
          THE COURT: -- millions of shareholders?
10
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: No.
11
12
          THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
13
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA: My name is Maria Carmona.
      have been living in Richmond for three years and I have lived in
14
15
      California for 28. My occupation is material handler in a
16
      warehouse.
17
          And I'm married. And my husband's occupation is the same as
      mine. Just in a different company. And I have a 16-year-old
18
      daughter.
19
          I have never served in the military, never served in a jury.
20
      And definitely I can be fair to both sides. But I have a little
21
      concern. I think the level of my understanding English is not
22
      very good. I don't know if that could interfere with this case.
23
          THE COURT: Well, have you understood my questions?
24
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA: Most of it.

25

1 THE COURT: That's better than most people. 2 (Laughter) THE COURT: I appreciate that. But have you -- you have 3 some difficulty understanding English? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA: Yes, my concern is that there might be some kind of vocabulary that is -- that I don't 6 understand. 7 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STALLCUP: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 9 name is Quinn Stallcup. I live in Napa. I have lived there for 10 11 20 years. I have lived in California for 22 years. full-time toxicologist. 12 13 I am single. I have no prior military service. I have not served on a jury before. And I do not believe I can be fair due 14 15 to a financial hardship. THE COURT: And what is the nature of the hardship? 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STALLCUP: My current job can only cover my absence for three days. 18 Okay. Thank you very much. 19 THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR NAESETH: My name is Eric Naeseth. I have 20 21 lived in San Francisco and in California for seven years. I'm a 22 software engineer. 23 Single. I don't have any children, and I have never served in the military or on a jury. I can be fair to both sides in 24

this case.

25

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANGEL: My name is Christopher Angel. I have lived in Sonoma, California, for 17 years. I have lived in California for 21 years. I'm a building engineer in San Francisco.

I'm not married. I'm single. No children. No military service. No previous jury service. And I can be fair to this case.

THE COURT: Thank you. Pass to it Mr. Pevna.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PEVNA: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is John David Pevna. I have lived in San Ramon, California for 12 years. I was born and raised in California but have lived in Hawai'i for five years, Nevada for two years, Chicago for two years, and three-month stints in Houston, Snowmass at Aspen, and Washington, D.C.

I am currently an autism specialist with the San Ramon
Valley Unified School District. But I am retired from banking
and the legal profession. I have worked at Bank of America,
Bank of Hawai'i, Bank of the West in their financial services in
the areas of compliance and legal departments.

I have also been the director of bank secrecy and anti-money laundering in one of my employments. I also worked for the California Supreme Court. I was associate Dean at Golden Gate University law school. I have taught at USC Law Center and I was a legal administrator.

I'm single. I have no children. I have no military service. I had one criminal municipal court case in which a verdict was reached.

I do believe that my background will lead me to be fairly critical of both sides, given my continuing interest in education and bank secrecy and anti-money laundering. I had relationships with auditors from the Federal Reserve, OCC and OTS.

I have also had experience with the three consulting firms that were listed, and do not have very high opinions of any of them.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOVERALBA: Hi, I'm Dan Doveralba. I have lived in San Francisco in California for 18 years. Director of engineering.

Separated, no children, military or jury service. I do not think I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: And you indicated that you had suffered some financial loss, is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOVERALBA: That's partially -- yeah,
that's true but I think the other part of why I can't be fair is
more substantial. And speaking that in front of the jury would
likely --

THE COURT: Yeah, okay, we don't need to go into the reasons. You just -- I understand. Thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR R.M. MILLER: My name is Ronald Miller. live in San Bruno. I have been there 35 years. I have been in California all my life. I work as a field utility worker for PG&E. I am married. My wife works as an office manager/bookkeeper for a small supermarket. Let's see. We have no children. No military service. I have served on two juries, both criminal. One we reached a verdict, the other we didn't. And I can be fair to both sides. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ENCARNACIO: My name is Remy --THE COURT: Thank you. Before we start, let the record simply reflect that Joseph Hutka, who was the juror who preceded you, was excused for health reasons. Go ahead. Go ahead. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ENCARNACIO: My name is Remy Encarnatio. I live in Dublin for 15 years. I have lived in California for 27 years. I am an engineering administrator for a telecommunication company. I am single. I have two children. My daughter is 19 years old and my son is 17 years old. I have no military service and I have no previous jury service. And yes, I can be fair to both sides in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAEDA: Hi, my name is Yumi Maeda, Yumiko

Maeda. I live in San Mateo. I have lived there for seven years. I have lived in California for 37. I am a contract compliance officer with the City of San Francisco, but I was formerly an attorney.

I am married. My husband is a Sysco programmer, manager with a biotech company. I have one child. He is two years old. No military service. Never served on a jury.

I don't think I can be fair to both sides in this case. As I mentioned, I was an attorney in my previous life. I -- my job was akin to a public defender so I represented individuals from marginalized communities who had very negative experiences with the criminal justice system. And that has definitely colored my view and my experience with the courts in general, the, the criminal justice system at large.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPLANDOR: My name is Mariechris Kiara

Resplandor, I live in Daly City and lived in California for nine

years. Prior to that I came from the Philippines.

And I'm a store manager, located in Stanford Mall. And my husband's also in retail management. We have three children. I have a 13-year-old, I have a four-year-old, and a five-year-old.

I have not served in a jury and I have no military service.

I -- I could be fair. But unfortunately my mom just passed away
last November, and my dad lives with me right now, waiting for
his, um, USCIS status which -- after which, any time now we want

to go back to the Philippines to honor my mom's ashes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PALO: My name is Patricia Palo. I'm from Vallejo. I have lived in Vallejo, California for 14 years. I'm a psychiatric technician at a state hospital.

I'm single, never been married, no children, never served in the military or jury service. I'm going to try to be fair to both sides, since I work in a state hospital and I work with mentally ill patients with criminal offenses.

And I also asked to be excused because I have a vacation coming up next month.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR L.A. COMBS: Hello, good morning. My name is Laura Ashley Combs. I live in San Leandro, California. I have lived there for about five and a half years. I have lived in California my entire life. So, 24 years. I am a case management supervisor for a nonprofit here in San Francisco that works with homeless and formerly homeless families.

I am single. I do not have any children. I have no previous military service. I have no previous jury service.

And I do feel that I could be fair on both sides of this case.

Though, as indicated on my questionnaire, I have several different family things that are current family medical things that are currently happening that sometimes cause me to have to go to Modesto, my hometown, unexpectedly.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. STEGEMAN: Good morning, Your Honor, my name is Shamal Mccord Stegeman. I currently live in Oakland, California, been there for about five or six years. The rest of my life has been spent in California. I'm currently the sole sales operations and shipping manager at my medical device company that I work at.

I am not married. I have no children. No military service. I have not been in jury service before. And I think I can be fundamentally fair to both sides of this case, but I would request a recusal due to the critical nature of my job.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: My name is Michael
Hernandez Soto. I live in Sonoma, originally grew up there and
I have lived there for the last year. I have lived in
California for 23 years. I'm a project engineer at a demo
company.

I'm single, no children. I have never served in the military, nor a jury. And I believe I could be fair on both sides in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR M.B. MILLER: Good morning, I'm Markham Miller. I live in Daly City. I have lived there for the past 18 years. I have lived in California for 22 years. I work in fundraising and development for a local hospital foundation.

I am married. My spouse worked for UCSF in learning and development. I have no military service, I have never served in a jury, and I believe I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY: My name is Richard Beaty. I have lived at my current address for 33 years. I have been in California for approximately 51 and a half years, except for a brief five-month time I went to the state of Washington. I was employed by the U.S. Postal Service for over 40 years as a letter carrier.

I'm single. Don't have any children. No military service.

Not served on a jury. A couple of times I got close and I was excused. And I think I could be fair to both sides.

However, there is a couple of things I want to say first. I have a very, very secondary connection to the Keker law firm. I used to deliver their mail for 13 years. Actually was a situation where I sorted the mail at 630 Sansome; they come from their law offices and pick it up.

I knew the woman that was a receptionist because I knew her brother.

I don't know if Roberta still works for you, I knew Roberta, we used to call her "Bert."

The other thing, I do have a medical situation where I have a doctor's appointment once a month, and usually it is on a Thursday.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONILLA: My name is Karen Bonilla. I currently live in Richmond, California for about two years and a half. The rest of my life, here in California. I'm currently property management, just an operations manager.

I'm married. My husband is a retail manager. We do have two children. We have a four-year-old and a ten-year-old. I never had any military service. Never been on -- done jury service.

And I can't be fair to both sides because I do start a new job March 1st. So that would just be extreme hardship for us.

I am leaving my current job, so I wouldn't have any seniority or any pay or anything in the new job.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUNGUIA: My name is Gustavo Munguia. I live in Menlo Park, California for 27 years. I work for VTA, Valley Transportation Authority, as an upholsterer.

I'm married. My wife is retired. I have two sons. One is 47, he works for Lucky Stores. And the second one is 42, and he is a salesman. And never served the military. And never been into a jury service. And I guess I can be fair.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENDRON: Good morning, Your Honor, my
name is Pierantonio Cendron. I live in Concord right now and I
have lived there for four years. I -- excuse me. I have been

in California for 12 years altogether. I am currently a baker.

And I'm divorced. And I have a five-year-old son.

I have no previous military service. No jury duty. And I

THE COURT: Where do you bake?

believe I can be fair to both sides.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENDRON: In Berkeley. I bake the best food in the world, which is pizza.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SANGPO: My name is Tsering Sangpo. Lived in San Mateo for 15 years and California for 15 years. Works as an NA and home health aide.

I'm married, and two stepchildren, 28 and 29. And spouse works as a cook. No previous military service. Yes, jury service once, criminal, but I don't know if it's verdict or not.

I can be fair, but if you can excuse me because I have a problem with my rotator cuff injury, so I might have to go back to the doctors and I might get the surgeries. So if I into the surgery I have to have like four or five months off, so I don't have enough PTOs and stuff if I stay here for long.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DRAKE: Hi, my name is Marjorie Drake. I live in Newark. I have lived there for 16 years. I have lived in California all but -- I'm 66, I have lived here for all but four of those years. When I was a kid we moved back to

Arlington, Virginia. For the last 20 years I have been a software engineer. I'm retired now.

I'm divorced. My son -- I have one son. He's 39. And he works on online sales for Lamp Plus. I have never served in the military. I have never served on a jury. And I think I can be fair on both sides of this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMASWAMY: Good morning. My name is

Shivkumar Ramaswamy. I live in Dublin and I have lived there

for three and a half years. I live in California for 19 years.

I'm an IT consultant.

I'm single. And I have one son, he's 24, he is a student.

I have not served in military nor have I served in a jury. And

yes, I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GUEVARA CORRAL: Hi, my name is Graciela Guevara. I live in Rohnert Park. I have lived there for 19 years. And I have lived in California for 24 years. I work in retail at Nordstrom Rack.

I am single. I have one child, he is one. And I have not served in the military. Nor a jury. And I can be fair to both sides.

THE COURT: Which Nordstrom's do you work at?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GUEVARA CORRAL: The Nordstrom's at Coddingtown in Santa Rosa.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Mirna Scheffy. I have lived in San Francisco for the past ten years and I have also lived in California for the past ten years. I also attended high school in Marin County. I'm an attorney, at a law firm in San Francisco.

I am married. My husband is an investment banker. We don't have any children. I have never served in the military. I have never served on a jury. And I can be fair to both sides in this case. However, I do have a vacation on February 26th and then I also have a trial --

THE COURT: Don't worry about the trial. Don't worry about the trial. I'll take care of the trial.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: No, I will have a trial of my
own on March 28th.

THE COURT: Sorry. You say a trial of your own?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: Well, I'll be first-chairing a
trial in San Diego.

THE COURT: Okay, what law firm are you associated with?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: Hawkins Parnell Thackston and
Young.

THE COURT: And what do they specialize in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: Products liability and employment law.

THE COURT: I would like to hand the microphone to

```
Ms. Kiziryan. I think you had, you were a bit late, so -- and I
 1
      understand why. So, could you answer the questions.
 2
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KIZIRYAN: I apologize for being late.
 3
          THE COURT: No that's all right, go ahead.
 4
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KIZIRYAN: My name is Yana Kiziryan.
                                                                  Ι
      have lived in San Francisco for three years and in California
 6
      for almost 25. I am the director of accounting at a renewable
 7
      energy company.
 8
          I'm married. My husband is a software engineer. We have
 9
      two young children. One is three years old and the other is
10
11
      nine months old. And I'm a nursing mother.
          I don't have military or jury service, previously. Although
12
      I can be fair to both sides on the trial, I was hoping to be
13
      excused because I need to take breaks to pump during the day.
14
      And also, I found out that my company only pays for ten days of
15
16
      jury duty per year.
17
          THE COURT: Okay, your husband is an investment banker?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KIZIRYAN: Software engineer.
18
          THE COURT: Oh, he is a software engineer. And by whom is
19
      he employed?
20
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KIZIRYAN:
21
                                       Cheqq.
          THE COURT: Pardon me?
22
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KIZIRYAN: Chegg, C-H-E-G-G.
23
          THE COURT: Thank you.
24
          So, ladies and gentlemen, we're moving right ahead. May not
25
```

seem that way, but we are.

I'm going to have a very brief consultation with the attorneys at the sidebar. And during that time, you are free to talk. Can't leave. But if you would like to talk to the people, your best friends, if you would like to talk to them, go right ahead.

In the meanwhile I'll see counsel at sidebar.

(The following proceedings were heard at the sidebar:)

What I like to do is give you a preliminary indication of people I would recuse for hardship or for cause.

THE COURT: So we are outside the presence of the panel.

You don't have to agree. You don't even have to state a position. But obviously, if you agree, you don't have to ask them any questions so there's a --

MS. LITTLE: Would you tell us whether they are hardship or cause?

THE COURT: Not really, because it's sort of a waste of time at this point. It may -- I mean, I don't know. I just didn't write it down on this list (Indicating). So, see where you are. I think it's fairly obvious why I recuse; maybe not.

No. 5. Higgins. 7, Jameson. 8, Yip. Y-I-P. I don't know what to do about 16, the guy from Sebastopol.

MR. LEACH: I thought the bus is a good idea.

THE COURT: In the final analysis I certainly would excuse him because he thinks it's a problem.

```
MR. REEVES: Right.
 1
 2
         MR. LEACH:
                     Right.
                     Then they don't, and I'm not going to excuse
         THE COURT:
 3
     him. But anyway, that's up in the air.
 4
 5
         MS. LITTLE: That was 16, did you say?
          THE COURT:
                     No, 16.
 6
         MR. KEKER: So that is up in the air is what you are saying.
 7
         THE COURT: By the way, they are all up in the air.
 8
         MR. KEKER: I get that.
 9
         THE COURT: This is just my first take on it. No. 24, okay.
10
11
      28, Rowland. 29, Craig. 30, Nori. 33, Barr. 35, O'Brien.
      36, Woebcke --
12
         MR. KEKER: You don't like Woebcke?
13
         THE COURT: I like him. I only have one year to try this
14
15
      case.
16
          37, Pressley. 40, Maganazook. 45, I don't know.
                                                             The
17
     mother issue is one that we can address.
         MR. KEKER: It is the ten days' pay. Also she worked for
18
     KPMG.
19
20
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. KEKER: And she was at KPMG and that is an important
21
      factor in this case.
22
          THE COURT: Okay, so I will probably recuse her. Excuse
23
```

48, Walker. 52, Wong. 54, Ling. 61, Stallcup.

her, whatever it is.

24

25

```
Just a second, Your Honor.
                                                  61, Stallcup.
 1
          MR. KEKER:
 2
          THE COURT: 64, Pevna. P-E-V-N-A. 65, Doveralba.
          MR. KEKER:
                     Done --
 3
          THE COURT:
                     Right. 69, Maeda. 73, Palo. 75, Stegeman.
 4
 5
      80, Bonillo. Bonilla, pardon me. And 84, Sangpo.
          Now, I would note that there are a couple whose English is
 6
 7
      dicey. So, that's something that I thought we ought to -- you
      can explore and I ought to hear them a bit more and maybe you
 8
      ought to hear them a bit more to decide whether -- you don't
 9
      have to be proficient in English but you have to be good enough
10
11
      to --
          MR. KEKER: I think actually in this case it is going to be
12
13
      important. There's only two that I think are at issue, two
14
      people --
15
          THE COURT:
                     That's right.
16
          MR. KEKER: Because the language is going to be obtuse.
17
          THE COURT: Yeah, language is pretty important. It is not a
      who-done-it or where-it-happened.
18
          MR. KEKER:
19
                     Your Honor.
                     Yes, Mr. Keker.
20
          THE COURT:
          MR. KEKER: What I'm planning to do is if -- accept this
21
      list, and unless I -- the only reason I would go question one of
22
23
      them is would be because I'm trying to rehabilitate them, but I
      don't think I'm going to do that, so I'm going to rely on these
24
      and not try to develop as much cause as I can, I'm just --
25
```

```
THE COURT:
                     Oh, think --
 1
 2
          MR. KEKER:
                     Try to save time.
          THE COURT: I think that's fine, but I think you have to
 3
      hear --
 4
 5
         MR. KEKER: Sure, if they want to rehabilitate them that's
      fine.
 6
 7
          THE COURT:
                     And then you have to act on your instincts.
          MR. KEKER: Fair enough.
 8
          THE COURT: But I'm satisfied at this point that I would
 9
      excuse all these people. That is my statement.
10
          MR. DOOLEY: Would the Court entertain a brief break so we
11
      can figure out whether it is worth our time?
12
                     Let's take five minutes. Is that enough time?
13
          THE COURT:
          MR. DOOLEY: Yeah, I think that's fine.
14
15
          MR. KEKER:
                     Yeah.
16
          THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
17
          MR. DOOLEY: Is the Court going to take a lunch break?
          THE COURT: Let's talk about that. I could actually send
18
      them to lunch now. If you -- because then they will get into
19
      the cafeteria before any lines and so forth. And get them back
20
21
      here at quarter of 1:00.
          MR. KEKER: That's fine.
22
23
          THE COURT: Or 12:30.
          MS. LITTLE: Great idea.
24
25
          THE COURT: And then you can use that time.
```

```
I don't expect it to take long, but this way
 1
          MR. DOOLEY:
      I'll figure it out.
 2
          THE COURT:
                     That is even better.
 3
                                            Okay.
          MR. DOOLEY: So let them go.
 4
 5
          (Conclusion of sidebar discussion; the following
     proceedings were held in the presence and hearing of the Jury:)
 6
 7
                     Ladies and gentlemen, the parties were so
          THE COURT:
      concerned about your well-being that what they have urged me to
 8
      do -- and I think it makes a great deal of sense -- is excuse
 9
      you for lunch right now.
10
11
          So I'm going to ask you to come back here at a quarter of
      1:00. You will have an hour to sample the really fine cuisine
12
      that exists in this neighborhood. I'm being facetious, because
13
      of course I'm referring to the federal cafeteria. But you
14
15
      probably won't get poisoned. And I eat there all the time, and
16
      it's just fine. And there are other places around.
17
          So, I'm going to urge you to go now because there won't be
              And be back here, at a quarter of 1:00. Again, with the
18
      admonition that you're not to discuss this case. And with a
19
      further admonition that you are to take the same seat you had
20
21
      before.
22
          Thank you.
23
          (Jury venire excused)
          (The following proceedings were held outside of the
24
     presence of the jury venire)
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Okay. So, proceed first with the government and
    THE COURT:
then the defense. And then, assuming we finish all of the
voir dire, we will excuse the jurors and take up challenges for
        And then we have to see where we are. I don't know.
    You know, I haven't even added this up so I don't know the
numbers yet, whether we are going to make it or not.
    We decided on four alternates.
    MR. KEKER: Yes, sir.
    MR. LEACH:
               Yes.
    THE COURT: Okay. So let's see where we are. All right.
Thank you.
    MR. LEACH: Thank you, Your Honor.
    MR. REEVES: Thank Your Honor.
                May we stay here, Your Honor?
    MR. KEKER:
    THE COURT: Pardon me? You can stay here, anything you want
to do.
    MR. KEKER:
                Thanks.
    THE COURT:
                Yeah.
     (Recess taken from 11:47 a.m. to 12:47 p.m.)
     (The following proceedings were held in the jury room,
outside the presence and hearing of the public and the jury
venire.)
    THE COURT: You indicated -- we have a court reporter
here -- that you wanted to mention something. You mentioned
that.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Yeah.
 1
                                                So --
                    (Inaudible)
 2
          THE COURT:
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Right, so I have bipolar
 3
      disorder. And part of that comes with anxiety attacks.
 4
 5
          THE COURT:
                     And you feel that you might have --
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Yeah, it's a daily thing, I
 6
 7
     have a half hour, have anxiety, I have to leave. It happens at
     work. Business travel, especially.
 8
                     Do you take medication for it?
          THE COURT:
 9
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Not for anxiety. They give
10
11
     you sedatives for anxiety. So, you take them --
          THE COURT: Nothing for bipolar disorder?
12
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Oh, yeah, Lithium.
13
14
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Latramagen (Phonetic).
15
                                                                 Ιt
16
     has a few names.
17
          THE COURT: Lomicatal (Phonetic).
         MR. KEKER: Yeah.
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Lomicatal (Phonetic).
19
          THE COURT: So you would prefer not serving.
20
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: I think it would be
21
     disruptive. Like when I'm in my office, about every half hour I
22
23
     have to leave. With work travel it's more frequent.
          THE COURT: That's fine. I think that's fine. And stay
24
25
     now, but we will -- you will be excused at the -- when I read
```

```
people's names.
 1
                       Okay?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK: Yes. I brought this
 2
      (Indicating) just in case, they said -- documentation from
 3
      psychiatrist.
 4
 5
          (Document handed up to the Court)
          THE COURT: Yeah, from -- all right. Doctor --
 6
 7
          MR. KEKER:
                     Dougal.
          THE COURT: Dougal, right, from Kaiser Permanente.
 8
      you very much, appreciate your willingness to come down here
 9
      today.
10
11
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MAGANAZOOK:
                                         Thank you.
          THE COURT: Okay.
12
          (Conclusion of discussion; the following proceedings were
13
     held in the presence and hearing of the jury venire:)
14
15
          THE COURT:
                     Can I see the parties for a moment?
16
          (Sidebar discussion held off the Record)
17
          THE CLERK: Judge, we are missing one juror.
18
          THE COURT: All right. Let's wait.
          THE CLERK: Yes, please.
19
20
          THE COURT: Which one is it?
21
          UNIDENTIFIED MAN:
                            32.
22
          THE CLERK: 32. Okay.
23
          (A pause in the proceedings)
          THE COURT: Okay, let the record show it's 15:50.
24
      Mr. Frentzen, you wish to commence?
25
```

```
MR. FRENTZEN: That's fine, Your Honor. Do we have all the
 1
 2
      jurors?
          THE COURT: Well, we don't. We're missing No. 32. I don't
 3
      want to wait too long. Let's -- we didn't spot him, so --
 4
 5
          MR. FRENTZEN: I'm fine with proceeding, Your Honor. I
      don't know if -- if there is a desire --
 6
          THE COURT: What do you want to do?
 7
          MR. KEKER: If he's going to be excused, that's fine with
 8
 9
      us.
          THE COURT: Oh, I'm going to excuse him, then, if he -- I
10
11
      mean, I don't know when he waltzes in, but we'll see.
          MR. KEKER: I think he ought to be here for all the
12
13
      proceedings.
          THE COURT:
                     Yeah.
14
15
          MR. KEKER: I don't have any objection to excusing him
16
      because he's late.
17
          MR. FRENTZEN: That's fine with the government, Your Honor.
18
          THE COURT: All right, then I'm excusing him.
19
          Okay, go right ahead.
20
          UNIDENTIFIED MAN: (Inaudible)
21
          MR. FRENTZEN: I'm going to proceed, okay, thank Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Yeah.
22
          MR. FRENTZEN: I didn't know if the Court wanted to say
23
      anything.
24
25
          THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead.
```

MR. FRENTZEN: All right.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. As we ran through early this morning, my name is William Frentzen. I am an Assistant United States Attorney for the United States Attorney's office for the Northern District of California.

I will try to stay by this mic but I want to address all of you.

I've been in California -- I work in California, in the Northern District. And if I could briefly introduce to you as well my colleagues.

Robert Leach is also an Assistant United States Attorney, same office. And Adam Reeves, similarly, Assistant United States Attorney (Indicating). We are all based here in San Francisco. And it will be our job to present the government's case to you as we go through this.

Beth Margen is a paralegal specialist, also with our office, the U.S. Attorney's office here in San Francisco. And Special Agent Alexandra Bryant is a Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. She also based here in San Francisco, California.

I think as I go through this process, number one, I hope to be brief. Number two, I intend to ask a number of questions which are really aimed at the entire group, and hopefully we can move through it quickly. If I ask you a question and you have a response and feel like you need to raise your hand, go ahead,

and then we'll pass around the mic and talk further about it.

But the bulk of my questions are going to be for you as a whole, just about a number -- a couple of broad issues that we are concerned about in this case. When I say "concerned about," not really concerned about, but more, we want to just make sure it's not an issue for you in serving as a juror on this case. And then I think I have a couple of specific questions for just a few of you, and I'll do those at the end.

There are -- and again, we have -- and you have seen us moving them around on the table, we have the jury questionnaires that you already took the time to fill out. And there is a lot of you that describe in the past, either yourselves or somebody close to you, some interaction with law enforcement. And I want to ask just a couple of questions about that generally. And if you have -- if we need to do some followup, raise your hand and we'll go ahead and do it.

But a number of you obviously, either yourselves or people close to you, have in the past been victims of crime. We don't want to get into all of that.

I have a fairly simple question: As a result of what happened to you or the person close to you that you described in the questionnaire, do you have any lingering feelings about being a victim, interacting with law enforcement, that cause you some sort of concern about sitting in this particular criminal case?

Does anyone have that sort of feeling where we ought to go 1 ahead and talk about it? 2 (A hand is raised) 3 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 4 5 (Hands raised). PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY: I have to do it in private, sir. 6 I cannot do it before the Court. 7 MR. FRENTZEN: I'm sorry, sir? 8 THE COURT: If you can wait until you get to the microphone, 9 and then if you stand up, identify yourself, that would be 10 helpful. 11 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY:** I'm Richard Beaty, No. 79. 12 13 sorry, I cannot answer that in court. I will do it in private. It's more than one instance. 14 MR. FRENTZEN: Can I have one moment, Your Honor. Does the 15 16 Court want to take this up at a sidebar? 17 THE COURT: Let me ask you this question, Mr. Beaty. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY: 18 Sure. **THE COURT:** First of all, thank you for responding. 19 Secondly, is the experience that you've had with law 20 21 enforcement, whatever that experience is, for, with, or being a 22 victim in a crime? And maybe we should define it, maybe we should break that down. 23 Were your concerns as a result of being a victim? Or were 24

your concerns as a result of any interaction you have with law

enforcement? 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY: Okay, I have to separate the two. 2 I've had numerous experience with law enforcement. And I've had 3 numerous crimes committed on me. 4 5 THE COURT: Go ahead. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY: First --6 THE COURT: Go ahead. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY: The first crime that was committed 8 on me changed my life. 9 THE COURT: And your feeling is that as a result of that --10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BEATY: I can answer, too. As a result of that, I find myself in a position, when it really comes down to 12 13 it, I do not trust anyone. And I repeat: Anyone. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I think that response will --14 15 MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you very much. THE COURT: And Mr. Frentzen, there was somebody in the jury 16 17 room. 18 MR. FRENTZEN: In the box? THE COURT: Yeah, the box. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALL: Kenneth Hall. I don't have 20 anything comparable to that. The two incidents, one involving 21 myself as a victim, was a burglary. And the response from the 22 23 police was, um, I thought it was outrageous. Very poor.

Second one was my nephew, arrested for drugs. And again,

when it came down to it, the police were shown to be very

24

negligent. And so I -- I question, I question authority, put it 1 2 that way. MR. FRENTZEN: And I appreciate that. I appreciate you 3 sharing that with us. Is this -- this sounds like it was 4 5 something that was -- had a meaningful impact on you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALL: 6 MR. FRENTZEN: And is that something that you feel like 7 could interfere with you serving as a juror in this case? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALL: I'll try not to let it. I just 9 want to let you know that I always look very skeptically upon 10 police. And sort of law enforcement in general. 11 MR. FRENTZEN: Sure, I understand that. And I quess the 12 question is, we don't know you. We've learned fair amount about 13 you, granted. But we don't know you before today. You know 14 yourself better. 15 16 And really, the issue is, I know it's a hard thing to do. 17 But we need to have sort of a preview of, you know, is this 18 something that you can do. In other words, if we get halfway through and you say: 19 really can't be fair, these feelings are coming back or 20 something like that, it's a little too late. 21 And so I know it is a difficult exercise, but can you -- I 22

mean, do you have a deep concern about serving on this jury

because of these prior instances that happened to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALL: I would say so, yeah.

23

24

MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you. Thank you, sir.

And, I don't think there were any other hands?

(No response)

MR. FRENTZEN: Great. And actually, I think Mr. Hall got into a little bit of this already. But the flip side of this, because my question was really about if you or someone close to you was a victim, the flip side is -- and I know for some folks they responded either themselves or somebody in their family had previously been arrested, and of course that happens in life.

The question really for the group is: Is there anything about that experience that happened to you or to somebody very close to you, that would cause you to have residual feelings where you could not serve in this particular case?

(No response)

MR. FRENTZEN: In other words, there's no feelings that somebody was so poorly treated by law enforcement that you -- you can't serve on this case.

(No response)

MR. FRENTZEN: Okay, great.

Moving on, there's a lot of news lately about politics.

There's a lot of news lately about, among other things, the

Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As I indicated when we first started out, the folks here in this courtroom all work in San Francisco, California. We are -- we have been out here, working on cases for quite some time.

```
That's our day-to-day job. We do not have -- we're not in
 1
      Washington, D.C.; we're not politicians.
 2
          And my question is --
 3
          MR. KEKER: Objection, Your Honor. I object. If you want
 4
      to hear about it, I'll tell you.
 5
          THE COURT: Well, I want to know what the objection is.
 6
                     The objection is they are politicians, and
 7
          MR. KEKER:
      Mr. Reeves did work in the Eastern District of Virginia.
 8
          THE COURT:
                     Well.
 9
          MR. KEKER: And this speech really has nothing -- if they
10
11
      are going to prove where they worked -- we'll cross-examine them
12
      on that.
13
          THE COURT: Okay. Let me -- I think the line of questioning
      is fine. Maybe I can take over here.
14
          There is -- there is a lot of publicity about the FBI and
15
      the Department of Justice. It's been in the paper for some
16
17
      period of time. And the question is, the question is: That
      publicity, that information, those reports and so forth, are you
18
      influenced by those, that somehow you will permit it to
19
      influence you in this particular case?
20
21
          (No response)
          THE COURT: Or are you so influenced by it anyway, by what
22
23
      you have read and what you have heard, that your -- your mind is
      uncertain as to whether or not you would apply it to this
24
```

particular case and to the government here?

Both sides are entitled to a fair trial. Both sides are 1 entitled to present their case as they see their case, without 2 jurors drawing inferences, one way or the other, by who's 3 presenting the case. Defense is presenting their case; 4 5 prosecution is presenting their case. They're entitled to present it without any presumptions that they are biased or 6 acting improperly. 7 Is there anybody who would disagree with that? Think it 8 might influence them in this particular case? 9 10 (A hand is raised) THE COURT: Yes, sir, okay, so there is -- we'll just note 11 that. You are number -- Juror Number --12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR PEVNA: 13 64. THE COURT: Pardon? 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR PEVNA: 64. 16 THE COURT: Juror No. 64. Okay. Thank you. You are 17 Mr. Pevna. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR PEVNA: Pevna. Sorry, thank you very much. Okay, you 19 THE COURT: Pevna. 20 may proceed. 21 MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you, Your Honor, I appreciate that. There's already been some discussion here today about a 22 couple of companies, Hewlett-Packard and Autonomy. This is a 23 criminal case; it is not a civil case. 24

As the Court indicated before, Hewlett-Packard is not a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in it.

party to this case. But, does anybody have issues with respect to either Hewlett-Packard or Autonomy, other than the ones we have already discussed earlier today, that would cause you concerns about sitting on this particular case? (A hand is raised) MR. FRENTZEN: Yes, sir. And I think we already addressed that. Did you have anything more to add? I'm sorry, could you just tell us your number, please. PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOVERALBA: MR. FRENTZEN: And your name, sir? PROSPECTIVE JUROR DOVERALBA: Dan Doveralba. MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you, sir. Yes. We got one more. **THE COURT:** What is your name? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: I'm Juror No. 10, Priya Kaul. I don't know if this is an issue, but just for full disclosure, my firm represents HP in many firm matters, including people I know. So. THE COURT: Well, yes. I mean, thank you for identifying it. Are you working or have you worked on any of the matters involving Hewlett-Packard? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Not directly, but I have spoken with colleagues about it offhand. But I'm not directly involved

THE COURT: And when you say you have spoken with colleagues

about it, were there -- did you speak with the colleagues or

privy to conversations in dealing with this particular 1 transaction? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: No. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. 4 MR. FRENTZEN: And -- oh, I'm sorry, we have got one more. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRAIG: Kirsten Craig, No. 29. I too have 6 spoken with colleagues regarding the Autonomy/HP acquisition. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 Thank you. Okay, no one else? MR. FRENTZEN: 9 10 (No response) 11 MR. FRENTZEN: All right. One of the issues that we expect may arise in the course of this case -- and again this is not a 12 civil case, this is a criminal case, we represent the United 13 States government -- is the potential issue of corporate fraud, 14 15 that's the allegation, corporate fraud against, among other 16 folks, a corporation. Hewlett-Packard. 17 And my question is really: Does anyone have deep-seated issues about corporations, about corporate America, that cause 18 you to think that this is not the type of case that you should 19 be a juror on, and this is not the kind of case in which you can 20 render a fair verdict to both sides? 21 (A hand is raised) 22 23 THE COURT: Yes, sir. **PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE:** Yeah, absolutely. 24 25 THE COURT: Hang on. Sorry, you have to wait for the

microphone. 1 And may I have your name? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Scott Woebcke. 3 Yeah, I think the fact that the government decided that 4 5 corporations are people is pretty pathetic, so naturally I'm going to have a bias against corporations with a history of 6 being intertwined with the military industrial complex and 7 government. 8 9 MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you, sir. THE CLERK: No. 36. 10 (A hand is raised) 11 MR. FRENTZEN: Oh, yes, ma'am. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DRAKE: I find this difficult to speak 13 about. 14 15 THE COURT: I need to have your name. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DRAKE: I'm 85, Marjorie Drake. 17 MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR DRAKE: Anyway, I was arrested in San Jose 18 19 during the Vietnam war. And at this particular demonstration, 20 it was a demonstration against, I would say, corporate America, 21 Dow Chemical and whatever. And my charges were originally felony charges and they were 22 dropped to misdemeanor. And I think got probation. But one of 23 our fellow demonstrators was convicted of felony assault and got 24

six months to life. And I spent two years visiting him.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, um, I didn't think that the -- well, I would say that the criminal justice system was far from unbiased. And, um, I still feel that today. Anyway. And so to be quite honest, I mean, I can judge facts. But I definitely have a deep-seated, um, bias against corporate America. MR. FRENTZEN: And just, if I could follow up -- I'm sorry -- briefly, that's something that makes you think this is not the right case for you to sit on? PROSPECTIVE JUROR DRAKE: Um, I -- I'm definitely against -if someone -- I think I could judge facts. And I would love to see a corporate America who's been -- people who have been fraudulent, I think they need to -- you know, I think I could be a fair judger of facts. But, I'm not sure that -- well, I don't know. Yeah. Ι think I could be fair in judging somebody, but -- anyway. MR. FRENTZEN: Okay. All right. Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate that. All right. Anyone else where they view that as an issue? (No response) MR. FRENTZEN: I would say animosity towards corporate America in terms of sitting as a juror on this case? (No response) MR. FRENTZEN: There is -- as we indicated, this is a

MR. FRENTZEN: There is -- as we indicated, this is a criminal case brought by the government. We've got to prove our case beyond a reasonable doubt. There is one defendant on trial

```
Mr. Hussain. Mr. Hussain is entitled to an
 1
      here.
      individualized decision.
 2
          In other words, we have got to prove our case against
 3
      Mr. Hussain, or not. But this is a case against Mr. Hussain.
 4
 5
      Other individuals -- what may or may not have happened to other
      individuals who do not show up in court and testify would
 6
 7
      largely be what we would refer to as "speculation."
          Is everybody okay with the notion that this is a case with
 8
      one defendant, and the only -- the question is whether the
 9
      government proves its case against that defendant or not?
10
11
      Anyone have any issues or problems with that?
12
          (No response)
          MR. FRENTZEN: Great.
13
                                 Oh.
          (A hand is raised)
14
15
          MR. FRENTZEN: Oh, I'm sorry. We have got a hand in the
16
      front row.
17
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRAIG: Kirsten Craiq, 29. Given my
      experiences with witnessing acquisitions, it is not always just
18
                   There's more people involved in this.
19
          MR. FRENTZEN: Well, that may or may not be true. But the
20
21
```

MR. FRENTZEN: Well, that may or may not be true. But the issue here is just -- the only question that this jury will be presented with is: Has the government proved its case against Mr. Hussain. And that's it.

Great. Okay. Thanks.

22

23

24

25

I would also just like to ask, as kind of a catchall, I know

that there's a lot of questions on that questionnaire. I don't want to rehash things that folks have already talked about. At the end of the day, both sides are just looking for a fair trial with a jury that can listen to the facts, apply it to the law that the Court gives you, and decide whether or not the government has proved its case.

Is there anything about yourself that was not brought up on the questionnaire or that we didn't already talk about, here in court, which should cause either side, the government or the defendant, any concern about you serving as a juror on this case?

(A hand is raised)

MR. FRENTZEN: In other words, have we just not touched on something that you think would be a problem?

Yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HIGGINS: I would like to apologize for not making it clear during the reading of those questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Higgins.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HIGGINS: Terrence Higgins, No. 5.

MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you, sir.

prospective juror Higgins: Serving on this trial would be an unmitigated disaster for my private practice. I would be able to receive no new referrals. I would have to transfer virtually my entire caseload to other practitioners. And it would take me two months to rebuild it. I would essentially be

out of income for four months. 1 And it wouldn't affect my impartiality, because by principle 2 I could still be fair to both sides. But I don't think I was 3 clear in saying that this is not the best time in my life to be 4 using four to five to six to eight weeks serving my society. 5 MR. FRENTZEN: Mr. Higgins, I appreciate you reiterating it. 6 7 I thought your questionnaire was pretty clear. But thank you, sir; I appreciate that. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HIGGINS: Thank you. 9 MR. FRENTZEN: I would like to ask a couple of questions of 10 11 a couple of individual jurors. May I have one moment, Your Honor? 12 THE COURT: 13 Sure. (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel) 14 MR. FRENTZEN: If we could get Juror No. 53, Ms. Combs, 15 16 Ms. Combs. I'm sorry, C-O-M-B-S. 17 Hi, Ms. Combs. PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: Hi. 18

MR. FRENTZEN: Sorry to call you out. I just want to clarify a couple of things that were on your questionnaire, if that's all right with you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR L.A. COMBS: Sure.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FRENTZEN: There's some commentary about capitalism, corporate America, and I guess the system in general. I know and I appreciate before you said you could be fair to both

sides. I hear you. I just want to make sure that what's on your questionnaire, are you still in the same place?

In other words, do you have concerns about serving on this jury, given the views that you have?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: Um, I would say, um, I have dislike for both sides. So I think I can be fair because I feel, you know, kind of badly about both. But I -- I think I can still be fair, even though I have those views.

MR. FRENTZEN: Okay. So in other words, if the government proves its case, you are not going to have a problem coming back with a guilty verdict.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: No.

MR. FRENTZEN: And if we don't prove our case, you don't have a problem coming back with a not-quilty verdict.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: No.

THE COURT: And you understand in this case, the argument is, as I understand it to be, that a victim in the case is a corporation.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: That a corporation was injured. Okay. That's an argument.

So the question is: Well, looking at that, if that's the case, I feel they ought to be -- corporations ought to be treated differently, or I'm not so concerned, or I wouldn't vote one way or the other. You know, I wouldn't vote quilty because

it's a corporation.

Do you understand what I'm saying? And we need to know whether that's your state of mind or whether you would simply say: Well, let's see what the evidence is. If the evidence shows that the defendant did X, I would -- and that's a violation of the law, I would convict him. If the evidence shows he didn't do X, then I wouldn't convict him.

Do you understand my question?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: Yeah. I think I would want to see the evidence and decide.

THE COURT: Okay, so you could decide based solely on the evidence, not based upon some feelings you have about corporations.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR A.C. COMBS: I think so.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. FRENTZEN: Okay, thank you. And if we could just go briefly to Juror No. 76. Mr. Hernandez Soto, I have a similar question for you.

Just, you had expressed some concerns in your questionnaire about sort of the system as a whole that -- and I just want to make sure, I heard you also say you can be fair to both sides.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: Uh-huh.

MR. FRENTZEN: Do you still feel the same way or do you have any lingering concerns about your beliefs causing any kind of problem being a juror in this particular kind of case?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: I think for this
 1
      particular case, I would be fair to both sides.
 2
          MR. FRENTZEN: Great. Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.
 3
          May I have one moment with my co-counsel, Your Honor?
 4
          (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel)
 5
          MR. FRENTZEN: That's all I have. Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
 7
      Thank you, everybody. Appreciate it.
          MR. KEKER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.
                                                              This is
 8
      afternoon.
 9
          And as and as I introduced myself before, I'm John Keker.
10
11
      And my law partner Jan Little and my law partner Brook Dooley
      are representing Sushovan Hussain.
12
          Mr. Hussain left Bangladesh with his family at eight years
13
      old, the evidence will show, came to England, and is now an
14
15
      English citizen and lives near London.
16
          I have some general questions based on my colleague's --
17
      esteemed colleague's questions to you.
18
          They read you a statement of the case, and they talked about
      corporate fraud and so on. Is there anybody here that thinks
19
20
      that corporate fraud occurred, or somehow has been proved or is
21
      what this case is about?
          (A hand is raised)
22
23
          MR. KEKER: Yes, ma'am.
          (A hand is raised)
24
          MR. KEKER: You've talked and sort of told us what you think
25
```

```
Sir, can you -- you are -- shoot. Juror Number --
 1
      about it.
      I'm sorry, what is it? What is your number, or what is your
 2
      name?
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: Are you talking to me?
 4
 5
          MR. KEKER:
                     Yeah.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: No. 28, Craig Rowland.
 6
          MR. KEKER: Okay, Mr. Rowland.
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: I thought the question was had I
 8
      heard that this was about corporate fraud. Yes, I have.
 9
          MR. KEKER: You heard that because that was read to you
10
11
      about what the government is alleging against Mr. Hussain.
          Does anybody think that corporate fraud actually occurred?
12
      That's my question. You haven't heard an inch of evidence.
13
          Do you have an open -- well, I guess another way to put it
14
      is, is your mind open to the possibility or the fact or the
15
16
      proof that corporate fraud didn't occur?
17
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: That it did not occur.
          MR. KEKER: Right.
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: Sure, yeah. I have another bias
19
      which I would address in private.
20
          MR. KEKER: Okay. All right. I'm not sure that's going to
21
      be necessary. But, okay.
22
23
          Is there anyone --
          THE COURT: I think, Mr. Keker, there was a hand raised on
24
      the other side.
25
```

(A hand is raised) 1 MR. KEKER: I saw him, and I don't think that's necessary 2 either, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay, all right. Okay. 4 5 MR. KEKER: Some of you, if you raise your hand and I don't ask questions of you, it's because I don't think I need to. I 6 7 mean, you know, sort of, yet. Because some of you have made your feelings pretty clear in the questionnaires and the 8 questioning, and we appreciate that, and we're ready to act on 9 10 it. 11 Just one second. Excuse me. Is there anybody sitting here that thinks that the 12 government wouldn't bring this case unless Mr. Hussain was 13 guilty? If you think that, you need to tells us. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: That's a tough one. 15 16 MR. KEKER: Pardon? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: I said generally, where there is smoke, there's fire. 18 19 MR. KEKER: Okay. THE COURT: This is Mr. Rowland. 20 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROWLAND: No. 29. MR. KEKER: How many jurors think that where there's smoke 22 there's fire? 23

MR. KEKER: Come on, most people think that where there's

(Hands are raised)

24

smoke, there's fire. Put your hand up if that's what you think. 1 At least let us know. 2 MR. FRENTZEN: Is the question literal? Smoke --3 (Mr. Frentzen raises his hand) 4 Well, actually the question is literal, and 5 MR. KEKER: there are times that there's smoke and no fire. Does anybody 6 recognize that? 7 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: 8 Yes. MR. KEKER: So if the government thinks there is smoke and 9 what they are trying to prove is fire they can't prove it by 10 11 just smoke. Is there anybody that disagrees with that. Is there anybody that is not willing to put the 12 MR. KEKER: government to the burden which the law gives them, and which 13 they have just accepted in these questions, which is they have 14 15 to prove what they are trying to prove beyond a reasonable 16 doubt? 17 Anybody have a problem with that? (No response) 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: 19 Yeah. MR. KEKER: Mister -- okay, you're another one that I don't 20 even think we need to hear from, sir. I think we've got you 21 22 covered. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Thank you very much. MR. KEKER: All right, thank you. I'm just trying to move 24 25 this along.

We've heard, and I have already told you, that Mr. Hussain lives in England. The evidence is going to show that he was the equivalent of a CPA in this company, operating under English accounting rules, being audited by an English accounting firm, Deloitte and Touche, but applying English rules.

Is there anybody here that is going to hold -- and I think the evidence is going to show those are the rules he had to play by, English rules, not U.S. rules. Anybody here going to be prejudiced by that or think that he should be judged by some different set of rules than the English rules that he lived with?

(No response)

MR. KEKER: The evidence is going to show that

Hewlett-Packard bought the company that he was the CFO of in a

merger under English takeover law rules, which are different

from the United States, the evidence will show.

Anybody have a problem of applying English takeover rules when thinking about this merger?

(No response)

MR. KEKER: And then a couple of final questions. And I don't want to insult anybody, but we need to know.

I think you were instructed when you first filled out the questionnaire, that it's important in this case to take the evidence from the witness chair, from the documents. From the courtroom, in other words, and not from social media, Google

searches and so on.

Is there anybody that has done that sort of outside-of-court research on this case since you first heard about it?

(No response)

MR. KEKER: Is there anyone here that thinks: I have seen so many people going around -- a lot of people can't even cross the street without an iPhone in front of their face. Is there anybody here that thinks they're going to have trouble getting through the trial, long trial, without doing research or searches or some of the -- using some of the tools that are available to you on the social media, news media and so on?

(No response)

MR. KEKER: So you -- okay. Because that's a rule that is going to be terribly important to follow.

I have some specific questions for specific jurors. And I'm going to start, I'm just going to go in order so nobody's going to be surprised.

Could we give the microphone to Mr. Flournoy. No. 1.

THE COURT: No. 1.

MR. KEKER: Mr. Flournoy, excuse me. Your wife works at Price Waterhouse Coopers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: Correct.

MR. KEKER: How long has she been there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: Seventeen years.

MR. KEKER: What does she do there?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it was written, I thought.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: She was in research -- learning and development most recently, and then audits before that. MR. KEKER: Okay, Pricewaterhouse documents for sure, and witnesses, maybe, will be involved in this case. They'll be talking about Pricewaterhouse. Given the fact that your wife works for a witness in the case, are you going to be able to be fair? PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: Yes. MR. KEKER: Okay. You expressed some concern in your questionnaire -- well, let me ask you another question. A lot of people made -- I don't know if it was a mistake or not, but Question 33 in this questionnaire, you were going down checking No, No, No. And Question 33 said: "The Court will instruct you on the laws and the duties as jurors. Will you be able to follow these instructions even if you disagree with them?" And you answered "No." Was -- is that what you meant? Or was that a mistake? PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: I thought that the question had a typo in it. MR. KEKER: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: So I answered the question as

MR. KEKER: And I'm not trying -- a lot of people -- I'm just trying to find out if you meant no, the Court will instruct

you on the laws, will you be able to follow these instructions 1 even if you disagree with them, what the answer that you meant 2 to give was what? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: It would be yes to that 4 5 question. MR. KEKER: And there was a typo because it goes off and 6 says "If 'Yes,' please explain." That -- it should have been 7 "If 'No,' please explain." 8 So you didn't mean -- okay. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: 10 Correct. 11 MR. KEKER: And then finally, you said, I think -- you said that you were a student teacher, and had five more observations 12 scheduled prior to the end of the school year, in order to 13 receive a degree as scheduled. 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: That's correct. MR. KEKER: Can you explain that to us and tell us what 16 problem that will present if you serve on this jury? 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: It's possible that my graduation would be pushed ahead. Based on not being able to 19 teach during the time frame where the observations are going to 20 be held by the university. 21

MR. KEKER: The only person that could answer this is you.

I mean, is this issue, possible conflict, something that would keep you from being a fair juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: No.

22

23

24

```
Okay. Would you like to be on this jury?
 1
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLOURNOY: (Shruqs shoulders) If the Court
 2
      decides.
 3
          MR. KEKER: Okay. Okay. Thank you.
 4
 5
          Ms. Morales.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORALES:
 6
          MR. KEKER: This is the time the lawyer can just make, like,
 7
      70 people he doesn't know mad, so I don't really want to do
 8
      that, but I need to ask you some questions about this.
 9
          Do you think you can be a fair juror in this case, given
10
11
      some of the things you have said in this questionnaire?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORALES: No.
12
13
          MR. KEKER: Okay. Um, well, I'm going to stop right there.
          And if I can go back, I mean, if there's any issue about it,
14
15
      Your Honor -- I'm --
          THE COURT: Well, I think I need to explore that a bit.
16
      Because you've answered, in a sense, you have answered the
17
18
      question both ways.
          You have now sat here for the morning, listened to a lot of
19
      questions --
20
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORALES: (Nods head)
21
          THE COURT: -- I have asked, the parties have asked. So --
22
23
      and you were early on in the process. But now you have heard
      all sorts of responses.
24
          So thinking about it now, knowing what the case is about,
25
```

```
knowing the parties as you now know them to be, the question is:
 1
      Do you think you can be fair to both sides?
 2
          Now, if you feel you can't, please let us know. If you feel
 3
      you can, please let us know.
 4
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORALES: I'm sorry, I take that back. I
 5
      can be fair, but then I just -- that my mind won't be fully on
 6
      the case because I have -- I'm -- because of the financial and
 7
      the -- who will be taking care of my son. During this time.
 8
          THE COURT:
                     Let me explore that, if I might, a little bit.
 9
      Now, we will be meeting four days a week. You will be expected
10
11
      to be here 9:00 to 4:00. And the case will be over some time in
      April.
12
          Given those -- and some days it will be fewer days than four
13
      during the week, but for the most part, four days a week.
14
15
      don't think ever five.
16
          Okay. Now, given that, would you be able -- from a
17
      financial point of view, would you be able to participate on the
      jury?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORALES: No, I wouldn't.
19
          THE COURT:
                     Okay.
                             Thank you.
20
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORALES: Okay.
21
          MR. KEKER: And there's some other questions that I could
22
23
      pursue, but --
          THE COURT: Well, no, that satisfies me.
24
          MR. KEKER: Okay. All right, thank you very much,
25
```

```
Ms. Morales.
 1
          Mister -- and I'm going to butcher this, Mr. Sayborivong.
 2
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Sayborivong.
 3
          MR. KEKER: Born in Laos. Again, Question 33, sort of a
 4
 5
      trick question. You said yes, you can follow the instructions
      and then you said "Court instructions are rules and I have no
 6
 7
      problem following them."
          So you are a person who, once you understand the rules, you
 8
      follow them.
 9
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG:
10
11
          MR. KEKER: And you think other people should do that?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: I think so.
12
13
          MR. KEKER: Okay. You expressed some issue earlier with
      your comprehension of English?
14
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG:
15
                                          Yes.
16
          MR. KEKER: There's going to be a bunch of business people
17
      and accountants and engineers testifying. No law enforcement.
      But engineers and so on.
18
          Do you think that their language will be something that you
19
      can fully understand?
20
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: I don't think I fully
      understand all of them.
22
          MR. KEKER: I'm sorry, I didn't understand what you just
23
      said. Say it again.
24
25
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: I say that I am not fully
```

```
understand every single, single word that they say.
 1
 2
          MR. KEKER: When Mr. Frentzen was talking, did you
      understand all of his questions?
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Most of them.
 4
 5
                     Were there some that you didn't understand?
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: Oh, I forgot already.
 6
 7
          MR. KEKER: Okay. Would you -- given your, your English as
      a second language, would you be more comfortable not to be on
 8
      this jury, or would you be comfortable to be on the jury? How
 9
      do you feel about it?
10
11
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: I feel more comfortable not
12
      in this jury.
13
          MR. KEKER: Okay, if you were in Mr. Hussain's situation,
      and wanted people to be able to understand the case, would you
14
      think you would be the right juror for Mr. Hussain's case?
15
16
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: I don't quite understand
      your question.
17
          MR. KEKER: Do you think you understand enough English, I
18
      quess, to, to comprehend the entire eight-week trial, and give
19
      Mr. Hussain and the government a fair trial?
20
          MR. FRENTZEN:
                         (Inaudible)
21
22
          MR. KEKER:
                      Sorry?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SAYBORIVONG: I'm going to try my best,
23
      but I'm afraid I'm going to make mistake.
24
25
          MR. KEKER: All right. Thank you very much, sir.
```

```
Mister -- Mr. Weiner, you are a building official in Portola
 1
 2
      Valley?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: Yes, sir.
 3
          MR. KEKER: And you were in the Air Force.
 4
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: Yes, sir.
          MR. KEKER: What were you doing in the Air Force?
 6
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: I was a hydraulic mechanic.
          MR. KEKER: You mentioned in the hardship question about
 8
      working for a small municipality. Is that -- you are -- are you
 9
      going to be able to be covered if you are in trial?
10
11
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: They will hire a contractor.
          MR. KEKER: Your brother had some problems.
12
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: That's true.
13
          MR. KEKER: How long ago was that?
14
15
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: That was 1984.
16
          MR. KEKER: A long time ago.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: Yes, sir.
17
          MR. KEKER: Are you close to your brother?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: Not particularly. We go fishing
19
      once a year.
20
          MR. KEKER: Okay, that's close. Anything about your
21
      brother's experience that would affect your feelings about a
22
      criminal trial?
23
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: Um, it was a proper verdict, I'm
24
25
      sad to say.
```

```
Okay. So, I stick with my question.
 1
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: He broke the law. He got busted.
 2
          MR. KEKER: And is there anything about that experience that
 3
      your brother had, that your family had, that would make you a
 4
 5
      better or worse juror in this case, for one side or the other?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEINER: No, I think that -- I think the
 6
 7
      justice system worked.
          MR. KEKER: All right. Thank you.
 8
          All right, I'm skipping a few, so -- Ms. Jameson, you can
 9
              I'm skipping. I'm coming over here.
10
      smile.
11
          Ms. Kaul. You, Ms. Kaul, you worked as a lawyer at Gibson
      Dunn & Crutcher. Fine law firm. Right?
12
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes.
13
          MR. KEKER: And you know that Gibson Dunn & Crutcher
14
15
      represents Hewlett-Packard in this case, suing Autonomy, suing
16
      Mr. Lynch -- Dr. Lynch and Mr. Hussain, right?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: I was not aware of that.
17
          MR. KEKER: You saw Mr. Wong, Michael Wong is a partner in
18
      the Gibson Dunn & Crutcher office?
19
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes.
20
          MR. KEKER: And Mr. Wong has been working with the
21
      government to try and help them as much as he can in the case,
22
23
      you knew that?
          MR. FRENTZEN: Objection.
24
          THE COURT: Yeah.
25
```

```
That characterization.
 1
          MR. FRENTZEN:
          THE COURT: Well, first question is: Do you know -- the
 2
      jury should disregard it.
 3
          Do you know Mr. Wong?
 4
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL:
                                   I do.
          THE COURT: And do you know what his role has been in
 6
      connection with this matter?
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: I do not.
 8
 9
          THE COURT: Okay. How do you relate to Mr. Wong? That is,
      does he give you cases, or do you consult with him?
10
11
          What's your --
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: He's a partner in the office that I
12
13
      work in. We haven't worked together in the past, but we know
      each other.
14
15
          THE COURT: Okay.
16
          MR. KEKER: And you saw him here today.
17
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL:
                                   I did.
          MR. KEKER:
                    Watching the jury selection.
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: Yes, sir.
19
20
          MR. KEKER: Did you know why he was here?
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: I suspected it had to do with
      HP-related matters, but I did not know.
22
23
                     You talked to him, didn't you?
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAUL: We said "Hello, how are you."
24
          THE COURT: I think, I think I have enough information on
25
```

```
1
      that.
             Thank you.
          MR. KEKER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
 2
          Mr. Hall. You mentioned, during Mr. Frentzen's questioning,
 3
      something about law enforcement testimony and your concern about
 4
 5
      that.
          There will be no law enforcement testimony that I know of in
 6
 7
      this long trial. There won't be an FBI agent or a --
          MR. FRENTZEN: That's not accurate, Your Honor.
 8
          THE COURT: There may be. We'll see. There may be law
 9
      enforcement.
10
11
          MR. KEKER:
                     Okay. We have been given an exhibit list --
          THE COURT: Well, whatever. Let's just -- let's just move
12
      on and ask him whether --
13
14
          MR. KEKER:
                     Okay.
          THE COURT: -- that presents an issue. Okay?
15
16
          MR. KEKER: Okay. I'm just -- I'll just move on.
17
          THE COURT: Okay.
          MR. KEKER: Mr. Yencer, Mr. Yencer, you said in your
18
      questionnaire that you would get paid for some period but not
19
      all of the jury duty.
20
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: Correct. For four weeks.
21
          MR. KEKER: Is that going to present a problem with you
22
23
      serving as a juror who can concentrate and listen to the
      evidence and make a fair decision and not be distracted?
24
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: I think I would be slightly

```
distracted.
 1
          MR. KEKER: Well, okay. You need -- again --
 2
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: But I think I can definitely be
 3
      fair, if I were selected, but it would definitely be a --
 4
 5
          THE COURT:
                     The payment, is it, like, do they say to you,
      you have 20 days off?
 6
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: Four weeks or 28 days.
 7
          THE COURT: You get 28 days off.
 8
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: Uh-huh.
 9
          THE COURT: So in other words, if we only do four days a
10
11
      week, that's four days charged against the 28.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR YENCER: I believe so, to the best of my
12
13
      knowledge.
          THE COURT: Okay, that's fine.
14
          MR. KEKER: Looks like seven weeks you would have, seven
15
16
      weeks.
17
          THE COURT: I would anticipate --
          MR. KEKER: I got it.
18
          THE COURT: -- that the jury payment would cover that period
19
      of time, but I can't make any promises at this time.
20
21
          MR. KEKER:
                     Or at least, close. Ms. Mei.
22
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Yes.
          MR. KEKER: And again, and Question 33, this kind of trick,
23
      everybody saying no, and then they kept saying no, and no was
24
25
      the wrong answer.
```

```
You said -- the Court: Will you be able to follow these
 1
      instructions, even if you disagree with them?
 2
          And you said no. Is that what you meant?
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Yes. Actually, English is my second
 4
 5
      language. So for that question I'm not really understand very
     well.
 6
 7
         MR. KEKER:
                     Okay.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Yeah.
 8
         MR. KEKER: Same questions for Mister -- I won't try it
 9
     again, the man from Laos. The same question for you.
10
11
          Is your English such that you think you would not be a fair
      juror for Mr. Hussain and the government, who want jurors who
12
     can understand everything that happens in this courtroom?
13
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Telling the truth, I think it's not
14
15
      fair for him because I'm not 100 percent understand.
16
         MR. KEKER: Okay.
          THE COURT: Is there anything that I have said to you that
17
     you have not understood?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: So far, it's okay.
19
          THE COURT: So far, so good. What about Mr. Frentzen?
20
     you understood his questions?
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Most of them.
22
23
          THE COURT: Well, that's good. Okay. And what about
     Mr. Keker? Have you understood his questions? About the same?
24
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Sometimes.
25
```

```
Sometimes. Not quite as good as Mr. Frentzen.
 1
          THE COURT:
      Okay. Well, we'll just have to -- we'll be working on that.
 2
          MR. KEKER: I was about to say that's not always a test of
 3
      English.
 4
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEI: Sorry about that.
          MR. KEKER: Don't be.
 6
          Okay. Mr. Knowlton. Right here.
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: Right here.
 8
                     She's going to get you the mic.
 9
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: Yeah.
10
11
          MR. KEKER: Mr. Knowlton, you talked about this four-hour
      commute from Sebastopol. You have a number of colleagues here,
12
13
      take a van pool or something with you.
          But you said: I have two kids at home that I care for most
14
15
      every day after work. I also see an athletic department; it's a
16
      four-hour commute each way.
          What is the answer? Can you be a fair juror in this case,
17
      given the transportation and the other issues that you have to
18
      deal with?
19
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: I think I could.
20
          MR. KEKER: Do you want to?
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON:
22
                                       Yes.
23
                     Okay. Why do you want to?
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KNOWLTON: I think this is fascinating,
24
      just being in here and seeing it --
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yeah, I told you all that these lawyers are so THE COURT: good, that even though the case is -- involves accounting and not really, you know, day-to-day street issues, it's going to be fabulous. It's just going to be fabulous. The experience is going to be unforgettable. Unforgettable. MR. FRENTZEN: Hard to live up to, Your Honor. MR. KEKER: We are going to skip a little bit and go all the way up to Mr. Schumann. Mr. Schumann. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: Schumann. MR. KEKER: Mr. Schumann, you also were one of those Question 33 -- you -- the Question 33 people that said can you follow the instructions, and you said no. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: No, I can follow the instructions. Like you said, that was a trick question. MR. KEKER: That's really, you meant to say yes. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: Yes. MR. KEKER: Okay. The Sebastopol commute not a problem? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: Not at all. I did it for nine years once, and then another seven after that, so yeah, I can make the commute. MR. KEKER: You said on your questionnaire that you were -had taken some courses in criminal law and introduction to law enforcement.

Yeah.

MR. KEKER: How long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: Oh, that was way back in 1970. 1 2 MR. KEKER: What were your reasons? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: I was going to become a police 3 officer but I tore up my ankle so I had to switch majors. 4 MR. KEKER: Do you have any other -- any experience with the 5 criminal justice system? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN: 7 MR. KEKER: All right. Thank you. 8 Ms. Floresjovel. Am I pronouncing it right? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: "Jovel," that was close. 10 11 MR. KEKER: Close. You said, you were an accountant, and 12 you work with Ernst & Young. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: They are the firm that come out to our biotech office every three months to do the external 14 audit. 15 MR. KEKER: And, Ernst & Young auditors who were working for 16 17 Hewlett-Packard will or may testify in this case. Do you -- will you be able to listen to their testimony in 18 an unbiased manner or --19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: Absolutely, yes. 20 MR. KEKER: What do you think about Ernst & Young? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: They are really good at what 22 they do. And they are very picky. And when they come out and 23 do our external audit, they are very thorough. 24 25 MR. KEKER: Have you worked with other auditing firms?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you are concerned.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: Not directly. They are the ones that come and sit next to me every three months, and we work together. MR. KEKER: Have you ever worked with Deloitte? PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: No. Although our -- our office does, but not myself, directly, no. MR. KEKER: All right. Do you have any opinions about Deloitte? PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: MR. KEKER: You said you carpool five children to and from school Monday through Friday, three families will be affected, and so on. Tell us how that's going to affect your ability to be a juror. PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: Yes. It would cause some issues to the other families that do not have transportation for their children. But because of the fires and the school that my daughter goes to was lost, they are at a different location which is closer to our home. And some of the other parents have agreed to help, if need be. MR. KEKER: That's great. People around those fires have been helping each other. So this is taken care of, as far as

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: Not quite there yet, but if I was chosen, then yes, I will move on to make it happen.

```
Would you like to be on this jury?
 1
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL:
 2
                      Okay.
          MR. KEKER:
                             Why?
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: Sounds fascinating, so far.
 4
 5
          MR. KEKER: All right. Good.
          Mr. Poopat --
 6
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Hi.
 7
                                          I'm Ms --
          MR. KEKER: Ms., I'm sorry, I beq your pardon, Ms. Poopat.
 8
      Very sorry.
 9
          You said in your questionnaire in response to the question
10
11
      about following instructions and so on, you said you will "do my
      best, " but you are not sure. Right?
12
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Yes.
13
          MR. KEKER: What did you mean by that?
14
15
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: So I have my own opinion, too.
16
          MR. KEKER: You have some biases that -- against certain
17
      races that you were worried about?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Yeah, to be honest with you.
19
          MR. KEKER: Yeah, no, I mean that's what we are doing here
      is being honest. But, do you have a bias against people from
20
      Bangladesh or brown people? Or who do you have a bias against?
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Do I have to tell you?
22
23
          MR. KEKER: Okay, no, you don't have to tell me. I mean --
      do you think that bias is going to -- would make you a fair
24
25
      juror?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: To be honest with you, no. 1 MR. KEKER: Okay. And you -- you are one of -- you kept 2 talking in your questionnaire about fraudulent activities and so 3 on. 4 5 Do you think some fraudulent activities have been proved? PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Yes. 6 MR. KEKER: Yes? The mere fact that he's here, you think 7 shows that there were fraudulent activities? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: No. Not in his case. But at my 9 I work in the bank. There's a lot of fraudulent 10 11 activities. So when I hear the word "fraudulent," I don't like it. 12 MR. KEKER: Okay. Well, only you can tell us. Do you have 13 biases -- which you have been very honest about. Maybe you had 14 15 better tell us, who are you biased against? 16 Are you biased against --17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Not him particularly, but I can be biased toward some races. 18 You're -- you have a bias against certain races. 19 MR. KEKER: PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: I'm afraid. Let's put it that 20 21 way. 22 MR. KEKER: Okay. THE COURT: Well, I'm trying to figure out -- we all 23 appreciate your honesty. I'm trying to figure out, the 24

defendant is from Bangladesh, and he is also a citizen of the

United Kingdom.

Given those two things, do you have any bias towards people from Bangladesh or from people from the United Kingdom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: No.

MR. KEKER: When you say that you will do your best, you cannot say that you will be fair. You say you will do your best to be fair. Right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Yes.

MR. KEKER: So why can't you say -- just explain this, why can't you say you can be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: It depends on the context and everything, the evidence I'm going to hear. And I'm not sure I can be 100 percent impartial.

MR. KEKER: And which way would your impartiality go? Is this something the government ought to worry about or something we ought to worry about?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: Either one, you know. I can go
against either one, I can go --

THE COURT: Ultimately -- maybe I can jump in here.

Ultimately when you hear evidence in a case, or the lack of evidence in a case, you will be influenced by it. As a matter of fact, that's exactly what we're talking about what the jury does. They listen to evidence, and it influences their decision.

So at the end of the case, after you've heard all of the

evidence and the law, you have to make up your mind. And you are going to favor one side or the other. That's not called partiality. That's not called unfairness. That's simply called listening to all the evidence and making up your mind.

Now there are some people who say: Well, you know, I don't care what the evidence is, I'm going to rule one way or I'm going to rule the other way. Because I can do that.

If that's the way you feel, we need to know that. Is that the way you feel? That you think that you might rule one way or the other, outside of what the evidence is?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT: No. I'm going to listen to the evidence and make decision.

THE COURT: And also, you mentioned the fact that there is an allegation here, you heard some discussion about fraudulent activity. And that is of concern to you. And it's been my experience, in being a judge, that charges, themselves, number one, do talk about behavior that is upsetting. But they're just charges. That is to say, they're not evidence of the -- of the activity.

So you could be against fraud or you could be against robberies or you could be against any number of things. That's okay. You can serve as a juror. But, you have to realize that there are -- they are just allegations. And it's the obligation of the government to prove whether those allegations are true.

Now, can you follow that?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR POOPAT:
 1
                                     Yes.
 2
          THE COURT: Okay.
                             Thank you.
          MR. KEKER:
                     Mr. Middleton.
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: Yes.
 4
 5
          MR. KEKER: Thank you, Ms. Poopat.
          Mr. Middleton, you were another one of the Sebastopol folks.
 6
      Any problem with the commute?
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: Did it for seven years, and
 8
      calculated it wasn't really financially worth the time. But I
 9
      will do what is asked of me.
10
11
          MR. KEKER:
                     I think they pay you $30 a day to come here.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: That's ten minutes of my time.
12
13
          THE COURT: I think it's been raised, actually; I think it
      is now 40.
14
15
          MR. KEKER: Still not much.
16
          THE COURT: Still --
          MS. LITTLE: Anyway. You're a registered financial advisor.
17
      What do you do as a financial the advisor?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: I calculate macroeconomics.
19
          MR. KEKER: For the benefit of those of us who don't
20
      understand what you are talking about, tell us what you mean.
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: Well, I figure out the age
22
23
      brackets of different populations. United States, Europe, Asia.
      And then calculate what products and goods are going to be
24
      needed to purchase for that group.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
As the age group gets older, we know they need more things
in healthcare. As the age group starts out younger, we know we
need more education.
   MR. KEKER: And who do you do it for?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: Financial Enhancement Group.
   MR. KEKER: Which is a corporation -- I mean, is a company?
   PROSPECTIVE JUROR MIDDLETON: Registered investment advisor
group.
   MR. KEKER: All right. Thank you.
    Jumping down to Mr. Conroy, No. 42.
   MR. FRENTZEN: Your Honor, I'm sorry, one juror's hand up.
    THE COURT:
              Oh.
   UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Can I be excused to go to bathroom,
please?
    THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.
    (Hands raised)
   MR. KEKER: Could she go too, Your Honor? (Indicating)
    THE COURT: Yes. Let's -- let's -- we're almost at the
point where I'm going to excuse all of you for a few minutes.
You don't all have to go to the bathroom.
   But we're sort of, you know, we are on the last leg here of
these things, and I think we can deal with the fact that -- and
the Court can take responsibility for the rather inelegant way
it framed the question of whether you can follow the law.
    The concept is very simple. You may disagree with something
```

```
I may say: The law is X. And you may say:
 1
      I said.
                                                            That's a
      silly law. Or: I have always thought it should be Y or just
 2
      disagree with it.
 3
          I understand that. People disagree all the time.
 4
 5
      question, though, is: Even if you disagree with it, do you
      promise that you will follow my interpretation of the law, and
 6
      not your disagreement?
 7
          Does anybody have a problem with that?
 8
 9
          (No response)
          THE COURT: No hands. So we've dealt with that question.
10
11
      Great.
          (A hand is raised)
12
13
          MR. KEKER: Mr. Conroy. Mr. Conroy, you said in your
      questionnaire something about a project that sounded like it was
14
15
      going to be finished before we all have to come back on the
16
      26th.
17
          Is that right?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CONROY: That's correct, yeah.
18
          MR. KEKER: Okay. So you don't have any conflicts or
19
      problems being a juror.
20
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CONROY: Knowing that the trial doesn't
      start until the end of the month, I should be fine, yeah.
22
23
          MR. KEKER: Good. Thank you very much.
          The next one I want to ask is Mr. Reisinger. Am I
24
      pronouncing that right?
25
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR REISINGER: Reisinger.
 1
 2
         MR. KEKER: You were another one on Question 33.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR REISINGER: I found it misleading.
 3
          THE COURT: My responsibility. Don't blame the lawyers.
 4
 5
     will never ask that question that way again.
         MR. KEKER:
                     Okay. You found it misleading --
 6
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR REISINGER: Could you read the question
      again, please?
 8
         MR. KEKER: It said: Would you be able to follow these
 9
      instructions even if you disagree with them? And you checked
10
11
     yes. And then crossed that out, and then checked no.
         Do you want to see it?
12
13
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR REISINGER: No, I remember doing that.
     meant to say yes. But then it said "If 'yes,' please explain."
14
15
     And what explanation is there?
16
         MR. KEKER: Got it. But there's no -- there's no mental
17
      issue, just a -- okay. Got it. That's fine.
         Ms. Palada -- or Mr. Palada, excuse me. Same thing about
18
      that Question 33. Did you mean to check no?
19
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR PALADA: Well, just like he said, it is a
20
     tricky question, so I can follow the --
21
         MS. LITTLE: How have you been following this -- these
22
     proceedings? Do you understand everything?
23
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR PALADA: Yes.
24
25
         MR. KEKER: Okay. Do you think you have any problem with
```

```
the language or -- that we need to know about?
 1
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR PALADA: I'll probably be okay.
 2
          MR. KEKER: All right. Thank you.
 3
          Mr. McClellon. No. 55.
 4
 5
          (A hand is raised)
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: Yeah.
 6
          MR. KEKER: Mr. McClellon, you're a reformed lawyer, right?
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: I never practiced. I was
 8
      licensed, but I have never practiced.
 9
          MR. KEKER: Okay, that was what I was going to ask you. You
10
11
      trained in the law, became a lawyer?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: I passed the bar in Illinois.
12
13
          MR. KEKER: And then, and then what did you -- did you
      become a software engineer right away?
14
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: No, I have always -- that's
15
16
      been my day job.
17
          MR. KEKER: Why would you not be a lawyer and be a software
      engineer?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: There was more money in
19
      software.
20
          MR. KEKER: Not a bad answer.
21
          THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't hear.
22
23
          MR. KEKER: There's more money in software.
          THE COURT: Well, I was still thinking about what the term
24
      "reformed lawyer" meant. I haven't met too many of them.
25
```

```
just wonder...
 1
          MR. KEKER: There will be -- there's a possibility that
 2
      there will be some software engineers testifying in this case.
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: Okay.
 4
 5
          MR. KEKER: Do you -- will you give they any more credence
      or credibility than any other witness?
 6
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON:
 7
          MR. KEKER: Nothing special about software engineers that
 8
      makes them different from other people.
 9
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR McCLELLON: I would imagine so.
10
11
          MR. KEKER: Thank you.
12
          Mr. Moy.
13
          Where's Mr. Moy? Hi there, Mr. Moy.
          You work for HUD.
14
15
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Yes, I do.
16
          MR. KEKER: And you are the audit liaison manager?
17
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: I did audit liaison years ago.
          MR. KEKER: You -- you heard something, you have some
18
      information about this case?
19
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Only that I might have read it in a
20
      magazine.
21
22
          MR. KEKER: Do you remember anything about what you read?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: No.
23
          MR. KEKER: Do you hold stock in Hewlett-Packard?
24
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Yes, I do.
25
```

```
And you say that might affect you?
 1
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY:
                                  It could.
                                             I don't know.
 2
                      But the indictment in this case is going to
          MR. KEKER:
 3
      charge that stockholders of Hewlett-Packard were defrauded.
 4
 5
      That's you. Right?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Correct.
 6
 7
          MR. KEKER: Do you think you could be fair, a fair juror,
      being one of the people that the government says is a victim in
 8
      the case?
 9
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: I don't know how to answer that
10
11
                 I mean, I think I can be fair, and I mentioned that
      earlier. But I'm human. And I look at my -- my day job, I look
12
      at conflicts of interest.
13
          And, you know, we have a standard called "appearance of
14
15
      conflicts" so even though I may be fair and so forth, I'm human.
16
      So I don't know how I'll react.
17
          MR. KEKER:
                     And in your day job with the Department of
      Housing and Urban Development, this kind of thing would not pass
18
      the appearance-of-impropriety or appearance-of-conflict test,
19
      would it?
20
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: We would probably not grant an
21
      exception if that were provided to us.
22
          MR. KEKER: All right. And you had some big losses in the
23
      stock market?
24
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Well, I have had some losses.

```
Any of it in your HP stock?
 1
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Pardon?
 2
                      Any of it in your Hewlett-Packard stock?
          MR. KEKER:
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: Yes.
 4
 5
                     Do you remember when those losses occurred?
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY:
                                  Oh, years ago. Twenty years ago.
 6
                     You follow Hewlett-Packard stock?
 7
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOY: I don't -- I'm not a person that
 8
      looks every day.
 9
          MR. KEKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Moy.
10
11
          Ms. Carmona Rios.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA: Which one works? Okay.
12
13
          MR. KEKER: You said in response to the hardship question:
               "My daughter goes to a far school, takes me 30 to 45
14
15
               minutes, I'm the only one that can take her."
16
          And so on. Is the transportation problem going to be an
17
      issue for you?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA:
                                     Yes.
                     Can you explain to all of us what the issue will
19
          MR. KEKER:
      be and what the problem is?
20
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA: Well, since I work during the
21
      day and my husband he works at night. And besides that, the
22
23
      getting worried over there, because I don't know how to write in
      English so many words so I -- I don't know how to make a long
24
25
      sentence. That's why I couldn't write everything I -- I wanted
```

to.

So beside that I have to take my daughter to school, I have my mom, that she's 86 years old. And she lives with me. So before I go to take my daughter to school, I have to take care of my mom too. And it's -- I have to leave my daughter, I have to drop my daughter to school half an hour before because I have to go back to my job too.

Something good, that my job is like three blocks from my house, so that way I can take care of my mom sometimes, come to breaks and lunch to take care of her. In the meantime, one of my sister comes and helps me.

MR. KEKER: Do you think if you were asked to sit as a juror in this case, that you would be able to focus on the case? Or would your outside issues affect you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA: Well, at the beginning I thought it was going to be for from -- something not too long. But I don't know, probably is going to affect me if it's longer than what I thought.

And besides that, something that I mentioned before, is still my concern about my English, you know, because here it is going to be a lot of, um, professional people, that might have a -- a vocabulary that I don't understand because my English is kind of basic to understand with my co-workers and some easy stuff.

MR. KEKER: Would you prefer to be off the jury?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA:
 1
                                      Um.
 2
          MR. KEKER: Not be on the jury, I mean.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR CARMONA: I really, I would like to be
 3
      here and participate, but I'm afraid that not to be as helpful
 4
      that I should be.
 5
          MR. KEKER: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
 6
          Mr. Angel. You said you were going to get paid for -- where
 7
      are you?
 8
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANGEL: Right here.
 9
          MR. KEKER: Do you have any kind of limitation on what you
10
11
      would be -- on work?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANGEL: Now that I found out more about
12
      the case, I should be okay. I have 20 days paid off.
13
14
          MR. KEKER: Okay. Good.
                                    Thank you.
15
          Ms. Encarnacio, you are another Question 33 person that I
16
      need ask.
17
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ENCARNACIO:
                                         Yes.
          MR. KEKER: Can you follow the law as given to you by the
18
      judge, and apply the facts?
19
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ENCARNACIO: Yes, I do.
20
          MR. KEKER: You checked no. And you meant to check yes?
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ENCARNACIO: I meant to check yes.
22
23
      sorry.
24
          MR. KEKER: Thank you.
25
          And then, Ms. Resplandor.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPLANDOR: Yes.

MR. KEKER: You said -- I think you told us before that there were problems. Your mother had died; you may be going back to the Philippines.

Can you be -- could you be a fair juror in an eight-week trial with all that's going on in your life?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPLANDOR: Um, I'm very used to making sure that, you know, I separate my life, my personal life with work. But at the same time, this is very current.

And as a manager, I also have to juggle scheduling people's lives. And with this, although I can see that the scheduling would be something that I could work on, um, I would hope to travel right away.

And in looking at my travel plans going back to the Philippines which is very important for me, I would love to go home by March.

So, I -- I would love to hear about this because this is very interesting case for me, and I could see that if I see more about this, I am learning something. And I think that, you know, Mr. Hussain would need some jurors that would really see through it, as well as the government. So that we could see the -- which is really -- if it's really fraud or not.

But I would really hope that you would consider my personal dilemma.

MR. KEKER: And what about the kids? You said something

about four kids?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPLANDOR: Well, I'm very fortunate that I have my family. My in-laws helps me out and my dad. However, I do have some schedule with my dad, come to his checkups. Due to his health.

MR. KEKER: Okay. So, where do you end up? Do you want to be on or do you want to be off this jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPLANDOR: Please let me out.

(Laughter)

MR. KEKER: That's clear. Thank you.

Ms. Combs. Laura Combs, No. 74. Ms. Combs, good afternoon.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR L.A. COMBS: Good afternoon.

MR. KEKER: Tell us about your hardship and whether or not you think it's going to interfere with your ability to be a fair juror.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR L.A. COMBS: About two months ago my mom was diagnosed with ALS. It's fairly progressive. And she will likely be passing in the next two years. She lives in the Central Valley with the rest of my family. So, at any given point -- like, I sometimes just need to go to Modesto to be with my family.

In addition to that, my paternal grandfather has also been diagnosed with multiple myeloma, and is currently battling that type of cancer, and isn't projected to make it past the summer. But we're still trying. But he also lives in Modesto.

And then there is my uncle who lives in Oklahoma, who was in October diagnosed with Hodgkins lymphoma, and almost passed from kidney failure. And that caused me to have to, like, just drop everything and leave work for a week and go to Oklahoma.

MR. KEKER: Okay. First, I'm sure everybody is distressed, listening to the ailments and things. But, you have to tell us: Could you be a fair juror sitting here for eight weeks, doing what you need to do as a juror, given what else is going on in your life?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR L.A. COMBS: I think I could be fair. I wasn't aware that there would be one day or more than one day a week that we wouldn't have to be here. That actually makes it a lot easier. I don't know if we will know that schedule in advance.

THE COURT: Yes, you will. If you are selected I will go ahead, when we reassemble on the 25th, and give you days that I know we're not going to meet. I may even have some information on that subject now, too.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR L.A. COMBS: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. That actually makes things a lot easier because then I can kind of plan a little bit better, if I need to go out of town.

I also, for work I only get five days off for jury duty.

But I'm salaried, so as long as I work, like, at lunches and after work and stuff like checking up on emails, I still get to keep my salary. So that wouldn't be a problem.

```
Okay. And would you like to be on this jury?
 1
          MR. KEKER:
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR L.A. COMBS: I would, yeah.
 2
                     Mr. Hernandez Soto.
          MR. KEKER:
 3
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: Yes.
 4
 5
          MR. KEKER: Another one of the Question 33 people. Did you
      mean yes or no when it said: Can you follow the rules?
 6
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: I meant to put yes, like
      everybody else, misunderstood it.
 8
          MR. KEKER: And then, let's see.
 9
          You said, with respect to 73 -- 33, I mean -- can you follow
10
11
      the rules, yes. And what did you say, and -- it is hard to
      read, "In some cases, yes."
12
13
          In most cases? What did you mean?
14
          Do you want to see it?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: No, I can't remember, to
15
16
      be honest.
17
          MR. KEKER: Okay. But can you -- can you follow the rules
      in this case?
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: Yeah. Now that I
19
      interpret the question like everybody else, I answer yes.
20
          MR. KEKER: And you said you have a strong -- I just have
21
      trouble reading it. (As read):
22
23
               "Strong backing of minority races, blacks, Latinos
               and Asians who I believe are at a disadvantage in
24
               comparison with other races."
25
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: And I don't think that'll
 1
      apply in this case. It was just my opinion.
 2
          MR. KEKER: And then you also said you work at your first
 3
      job and --
 4
 5
               "Very new. I'll be missing valuable time."
          And so on. Is this going to cause a problem for you?
 6
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: I think it could be --
 7
      put in a dent and slow down my career goals in this profession
 8
      I'm trying to get into.
 9
          MR. KEKER: And the profession is being a contractor?
10
11
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: Yeah, I'm working my way
      to become a project manager.
12
          MR. KEKER: Okay. Well, same question for you. Do you want
13
      to be on the jury or not want to be on the jury?
14
15
          What, where's your --
16
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR HERNANDEZ SOTO: I would like to not be on
17
      the jury, because it would help me keep my career goals in line.
          MR. KEKER: Okay.
                             Thank you very much.
18
          Almost done, Your Honor. Could we approach, sidebar?
19
      second.
20
          THE COURT: Okay. Do we need it on the record or not?
21
                     No, definitely not.
          MR. KEKER:
22
          MR. FRENTZEN: Is there a number we should have in mind?
23
24
          MR. KEKER: Yes, 78.
          (Sidebar discussion held off the Record)
25
```

```
Okay. So is that it?
 1
          THE COURT:
         MR. KEKER: Not quite, Your Honor. Almost.
 2
          THE COURT:
                    Almost. Okay.
 3
         MR. KEKER: Mr. Munquia. Am I pronouncing that right?
 4
 5
     Munguia?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUNGUIA: Yes.
 6
         MR. KEKER: You said, when asked about being fair, you said
 7
      "I quess I can be fair."
 8
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUNGUIA: Yes.
 9
         MR. KEKER: What did you mean?
10
11
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUNGUIA: I mean yes.
         MR. KEKER: Okay. And I hate to tell you, Your Honor, but I
12
13
     don't have any more questions.
          THE COURT: Oh, okay. Does the government have any further
14
15
     questions?
16
         MR. FRENTZEN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
         THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. So, ladies and gentlemen, you
17
     have been very patient. And we are, I would say 82.4 percent
18
      finished. That's a quess, I want to tell you.
19
20
         But what we're going to do now is take 20 minutes, where
     you're going to go outside and wander around and I'm going to
21
     have a discussion with the government. And so if you come back
22
23
     here, we'll say 20 to 3:00. Twenty to 3:00. Who knows if that
     clock is accurate. But, 20 to 3:00.
24
         Remember, don't discuss the case. And please take the same
25
```

```
seats that you sat in before. But everybody has to leave.
 1
          (Jury venire is excused from the courtroom)
 2
          (Off-the-Record discussion between the Court and Clerk)
 3
          THE COURT:
                    Have a seat.
 4
 5
          THE CLERK:
                     No. 25.
 6
          THE COURT: Mr. Johnston? Is he Mr. Johnston?
     Mr. Johnston had approached my courtroom deputy, and said that
 7
     maybe the jurors should be aware of the fact that deliberations
 8
      can take extra days. That's very helpful.
 9
10
         MR. KEKER: Jury foreman, Your Honor. In charge.
11
          THE COURT: Yeah, okay. That's not -- all right.
      is what I would like to do. Which is, go through a list of
12
     people that I would excuse for cause based upon their responses.
13
      If you disagree, say you disagree. And we will have a
14
15
     discussion about it. If you agree, you don't have to say
16
      anything. Okay?
17
         Because I think it is a good idea to come up to the podium
18
      so I make sure that I hear whatever your position is.
         Okay. Are we ready?
19
20
         MR. FRENTZEN: Government's ready, Your Honor. Hopefully I
21
     will be able to recognize which jurors you are talking about as
22
     you go through.
          THE COURT: Okay. And then of course, that's without any
23
     adjudication of the ones that you may have, obviously.
24
25
          Okay. Juror No. 5, Higgins. And I'll take it that if you
```

```
don't respond, you agree. Or you don't object. Maybe that's a
 1
      better way to do it.
 2
          No. 7, Jameson.
 3
          No. 8, Yip.
 4
          No. 24, Aoki.
 5
 6
          28 Rowland, unless you people insist that he stay. And even
      if you did, I would kick him off.
 7
          29, Craiq. 30, Nori.
 8
          33, Barr. 35, O'Brien.
 9
          MR. KEKER: Have you excused --
10
          THE COURT: Pardon?
11
          MR. KEKER: You already excused Antaki, Your Honor.
12
          THE CLERK: He's still here.
13
          MR. KEKER: Well, he might be here, but I thought we -- when
14
15
      Mr. Frentzen got up and --
          THE COURT: Yeah, right.
16
17
          MR. FRENTZEN: 32, Your Honor.
18
          MR. KEKER:
                     32 --
19
          THE COURT: Oh, sorry, yeah. I have done this out of order,
20
      a little bit out of order. Mr. Antaki waltzed back in. And the
21
      only question I have is since I said I would excuse him, if both
      of you want him to stay, he can stay, but --
22
23
          MS. LITTLE: No, we don't.
          THE COURT: Okay, so he's out. What number is he?
24
25
          MR. KEKER: 32, Your Honor.
```

MR. FRENTZEN: 32.

THE COURT: Better write them down.

Okay. So, where did I leave off? Mr. O'Brien, I ought to go back. Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Woebcke. 36, Woebcke. 37, Pressley. 40, Maganazook. I don't know where we are on Kiziryan, number 45. I didn't -- she is on the list as missing. But I think she did other things too.

MR. FRENTZEN: Your Honor, she was missing this morning, but then she showed up. The issues were she had a quasi-medical issue in terms of her needing a couple of breaks during the course of the day.

THE COURT: But that was the only thing.

MR. FRENTZEN: And -- well, that was the only thing that the Court had noticed. I know that counsel for the defendant raised the issue that there was some connection at some point to Ernst & Young, but that, it was not -- I don't think that was ruled on, if that makes sense.

So we don't see basis to kick No. 45 unless the Court is concerned about the breaks that she would need during the course of the day.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not concerned about that.

MR. FRENTZEN: Okay.

THE COURT: I mean, I would honor that, even if they are coming at odd times, I can honor that.

MR. FRENTZEN: So we would object to 45 being stricken.

```
THE COURT: Let's discuss.
 1
 2
         MR. FRENTZEN: Sure.
         THE COURT: Okay. 48, Walker. 52, Wong. 54, Ling. 61,
 3
      Stallcup. 64, Pevna.
 4
 5
         MR. KEKER:
                    Can you --
 6
         THE COURT: Pardon me?
 7
         MR. KEKER: 61, okay.
         THE COURT: Yeah, Stallcup. 64, Pevna.
 8
         MR. KEKER: 54 or 64? 64, sorry.
 9
         THE COURT: Let me go back. It's important to make sure
10
11
     that I'm on the same page.
         So, 52, Wong. 54, Ling. 61, Stallcup. 64, Pevna.
12
                                                              65,
     Doveralba. 69, Maeda. 73, Palo. 75, Stegeman. 80, Bonilla.
13
      84, Sanqpo.
14
15
                    12, Hall. 2, Morales.
         79, Beaty.
16
         MR. KEKER: Wait, now --
17
         THE COURT: Now I'm going back.
                    Okay, back.
18
         MR. KEKER:
19
         THE COURT:
                    As a result basically of the voir dire --
20
         MR. KEKER:
                    Right.
21
         THE COURT: -- of the parties. Okay. 79, Beaty. 12, Hall.
     2, Morales.
22
                    Where was -- Hall, okay, gone. Okay. Morales.
23
         MR. KEKER:
         THE COURT: Morales. 4, Saborivong.
24
25
         MR. KEKER: Right.
```

```
10, Kaul. 14, Mei.
 1
          THE COURT:
         Now, 58 presents an interesting question. Does either party
 2
     want 58 excused?
 3
         MR. FRENTZEN: May I have one moment, Your Honor?
 4
 5
         MR. KEKER:
                     Yes.
          THE COURT: Okay. Excused. This is a Hewlett-Packard
 6
      shareholder.
 7
         MR. KEKER: Yes.
 8
         MR. FRENTZEN: That's fine.
 9
         MR. KEKER: With losses.
10
11
         MR. FRENTZEN: That's fine.
         THE COURT: That's clearly for cause, unless the parties
12
      said: Look, I don't care. I mean --
13
         MR. KEKER:
                    We care.
14
15
         THE COURT:
                     Okay. 60, Carmona Rios.
16
         72 gives me some concern.
17
         MR. KEKER: She's the one who wants to go to the
     Philippines?
18
          THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, that's the problem.
19
         MR. KEKER: No objection to excusing her.
20
         MR. FRENTZEN: Your Honor, I just feel like if she needs to
21
     go, we're going to end up having to let her go. So it's just
22
     whether or not we want to take the risk with the alternates.
23
      I'm --
24
          THE COURT: Well, when she said that she wants to go in
25
```

```
March, that was of concern to me. I mean, because if she said:
 1
      Well, I want to go -- I mean she wants to bury her mother's
 2
      ashes. And I just think, you know, how she may be affected.
 3
      She's -- they're on the mantel, or wherever you keep your
 4
 5
      mother's ashes.
          MR. FRENTZEN: May I have a moment, Your Honor?
 6
          (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel)
 7
          MR. FRENTZEN: Yeah, we're fine with that, Your Honor.
 8
 9
          THE COURT: Okay. So, she's gone.
10
          MR. FRENTZEN: We agree.
11
          THE COURT:
                        All right, so let's go back to the one that;
      Kiziryan, No. 45. What is the position of the parties on 45?
12
13
      The government objects, thinks that she ought to serve. Is that
14
      right?
15
          MR. FRENTZEN: Yes, Your Honor.
16
          THE COURT: Okay. So --
17
          SPECIAL AGENT BRYANT: (Inaudible)
          THE COURT: Do you want to be heard, anybody want to be
18
      heard on this?
19
          MR. KEKER: I do, sure. I'm trying to get this, the
20
      questionnaire --
21
          THE COURT: Okay, take your time.
22
23
          MR. KEKER: I understand she worked at KPMG. KPMG is going
      to be an important witness that we talked about. What KPMG
24
      thought about this, that, the other thing, she worked there for
25
```

12 years, as I understand it. 1 Let me look at the -- no, no, this is Kir -- Kiziryan. 2 THE COURT: Yeah, I don't think it is the one that -- I 3 don't know what basis for recusing her other than she's a 4 5 feeding mother, which is not the basis --MS. LITTLE: Well, she lost money in the stock market. She 6 worked at KPMG. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. KEKER: And, let's see, what else? It's mostly the KPMG 9 piece. She's the one who says she needs to pump and then she 10 11 also said she only gets paid for ten days, I thought, of jury service. But that may be wrong. 12 **THE COURT:** What's the government's position? 13 MR. FRENTZEN: Your Honor, other than I think the financial 14 15 hardship issue which I think the Court, if it needed to, could 16 address it or could clarify, and if the Court needs to see, she 17 lists KPMG with three other accounting jobs along and then you 18 add her current one, I think, so four different accounting jobs, it's not developed to the point where there is any sort of 19 potential bias. She doesn't know anything about this case. 20 She didn't indicate the nature of the case would affect her. 21 think --22 I'm going to deny the challenge. Okay. 23 THE COURT:

MR. FRENTZEN: She didn't --

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Now, the question is, first turning to

```
the government, are there any other people that you think should
 1
     be excused for cause?
 2
         MR. FRENTZEN: Yes, Your Honor. Except if I can just have
 3
     one moment, actually, most of them may already be gone.
 4
 5
          (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel)
         MR. FRENTZEN: Your Honor, the good faith has three
 6
 7
      for-cause challenges to add to the Court's list. They are 53,
      76, and 85.
 8
          THE COURT: Okay, let me look. The one who dislikes both
 9
      sides.
10
11
         MR. KEKER:
                    Which one, 85? Is that the third one?
12
         MR. FRENTZEN: Yeah.
13
          THE COURT: She dislikes both sides. Okay, well, all right.
      Is that --
14
15
         MR. KEKER: We oppose.
16
         THE COURT: You like that she dislikes both sides.
17
         MR. KEKER: Yes. That's a start.
         MR. FRENTZEN: And --
18
          THE COURT: Okay, so that's denied. What's next?
19
         MR. FRENTZEN: All right. 76, Your Honor. Thinks that it's
20
     going to impact his career. And there's also --
21
22
          THE COURT: What is that? That was just silly. I mean I
23
      listened to him, some kid out there who thinks that the decision
     he makes today will determine whether or not he gets the Nobel
24
      Prize. I mean, give me a break. We all make sacrifices. Maybe
25
```

```
it will enhance his career.
 1
 2
          MR. FRENTZEN: I just --
          THE COURT:
                     Who knows. I'm not doing it because of that.
 3
          MR. FRENTZEN: Well, okay. I mean there were -- with
 4
 5
      respect to both of these, it was also what was in the
 6
      questionnaire. I mean --
          THE COURT: Well, if you want to point something out to me
 7
      that I should look at --
 8
          MR. FRENTZEN: Sure. Question -- with respect to Juror 53
 9
      who doesn't like either side.
10
11
          THE COURT: Okay, wait. Let me look at it.
12
          MR. FRENTZEN:
                         Sure.
13
          THE COURT:
                     Because I will grant you if they said something
      that is more powerful or more persuasive than --
14
15
          (The Court examines document)
16
          THE COURT: Okay, so what do you want me to look at?
17
          MR. FRENTZEN: On 53, Your Honor, Question 31 and 32.
          THE COURT: Okay, let me look.
18
          (The Court examines document)
19
          THE COURT: I mean, I think her response to Question 32 is
20
      troubling. She says (As read):
21
               "I believe that capitalism is inherently the source
22
23
               of most hardship on the planet and the government
               that protects corporations' capitalism is also to
24
               blame."
25
```

```
I mean, I'm going to -- I'm going to excuse her.
 1
                                                            That's
     Number --
 2
         MR. FRENTZEN: 53, Your Honor.
 3
         MR. KEKER: We object, Your Honor.
 4
 5
         THE COURT: Over objection.
         MR. KEKER: I don't think that's enough, so we will just
 6
     object.
 7
          THE COURT: Okay.
 8
         MR. FRENTZEN: And No. 76, Your Honor.
 9
          THE COURT: So 76, do you want me to look at something that
10
     he wrote?
11
         MR. FRENTZEN: Yes, Your Honor. Briefly. It's the same two
12
     questions. 31 and 32. In addition to his clearly not wanting
13
     to be here, and thinking that it's going to impact him. And,
14
15
     you know, I can't comment on the beginning of a career and if
16
     you're starting a new job. But it is what it is.
17
          THE COURT: All right, what do you want me to look at?
18
      32.
         MR. FRENTZEN: Question 31 and 32, Your Honor.
19
20
         MR. KEKER: 32 says:
21
               "I am a Catholic and regularly attend church."
          THE COURT: Where is that? I must miss it.
22
         MR. FRENTZEN: 31 and 32 --
23
          THE COURT: What number is it?
24
25
         MR. FRENTZEN: 76, Your Honor.
```

```
Oh, okay.
 1
          THE COURT:
                                 Wait.
         MR. FRENTZEN: It says it could cause him to not be fair in
 2
      this case. I'm adding that to the personal situation.
 3
          (The Court examines document)
 4
 5
          THE COURT: You want me to look at --
         MR. FRENTZEN: And Your Honor, I guess I just, in addition,
 6
      in terms of his career, I just wasn't clear that he was going to
 7
     get paid. And if he's not going to get paid, that's clearly a
 8
     concern for the government.
 9
          THE COURT: "I have a strong..." What does he say?
10
11
      "...history" I guess. What does he say? "...backing" --
          SPECIAL AGENT BRYANT: "...backing of minority races..."
12
          THE COURT: "...where I believe we are at a disadvantage in
13
      comparison to all others."
14
          I just don't see how that applies in this case.
15
16
      really? Is there anything that's going to be suggested in the
17
     evidence about a racial bias or disadvantage or anything like --
18
         MR. DOOLEY: (Shakes head)
          THE COURT: I just don't see it.
19
         MR. FRENTZEN: No, nor do I, Your Honor. It was -- along
20
     with the personal issues, that gave us pause.
21
          THE COURT: I'm not going to excuse him. Over objection.
22
23
         MR. FRENTZEN: That's fine. And then the last one is
     Juror 85, Your Honor.
24
          (The Court examines document)
25
```

THE COURT: 85.

MR. FRENTZEN: And 85, Your Honor, had an issue with the nature of the case, the type of case, with the notion of corporate fraud. And while she said "I can follow the facts," she would always say "...but I have my views on this," and so on, and would never just sort of fully come out and say: "I can be fair in this type of case."

She also, at least in her questionnaire -- well, I won't mention the van, Your Honor, in the questionnaire, but --

(Off-the-Record discussion between defendant and counsel)

MR. FRENTZEN: Deep-seated bias against corporate America, which I grant you, could cut both ways in this case. But at the same time, she was expressing to me a concern with being a juror in this type of case.

She reiterated "I can follow the facts." But she wouldn't stop saying "but" and then saying that she was going to have difficulty in this type of case.

She also just -- the Court has the questionnaire on No. 38. She needs time to move into a van.

MR. KEKER: We oppose, Your Honor. She is a software engineer. The government asked --

THE COURT: I don't think it's a challenge for cause. The van, I don't think that is a cause challenge.

MR. FRENTZEN: I'm not relying on the van, Your Honor, I'm relying on other things.

```
If it were a Winnebago, I might have to take
 1
          THE COURT:
      another look at it.
 2
          Okay. So of the three you've raised, I'm eliminating
 3
      Juror No. 53, Combs.
 4
 5
          MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: All right. Mr. Keker?
 6
          MR. KEKER: Juror No. 1, Your Honor, whose wife works for
 7
      PricewaterhouseCoopers is too close to the case.
 8
          THE COURT:
                     Right. Denied.
 9
                                       Okay.
          MR. KEKER: Juror No. 26, Ms. Poopat. Turning to her, we
10
11
      asked her some questions. You rehabilitated her to some extent,
      I recognize that.
12
          But when you look at her questionnaire, No. 26, she talks,
13
      "Fraudulent activities are very bad in my opinion."
14
15
          "I'm inclined to be biased against some races from my past
16
      experience."
17
          THE COURT: But not the Bangladesh.
          MR. KEKER: Well, I don't know. "A friend of mine used to
18
19
      be a victim of fraud."
20
          The question about 33, "I'll do my best but not sure."
21
          35, again as a banker, "Fraudulent activities are bad in my
      profession."
22
          THE COURT: I'm going to excuse her. I just -- my feeling
23
      towards her is that she is -- her sort of electric, automatic
24
```

response to a charge of fraud, and she said, "You say it, and

```
it's one of the worst things."
 1
          Now, I know she also said she would listen to the evidence
 2
      and so forth. But I'm not confident that she -- well, I'll
 3
      reserve ruling. What is your opinion?
 4
 5
          MR. FRENTZEN: Your Honor, we actually object. She did
      rehabilitate herself. She made it clear that whatever issue she
 6
 7
      has that she's being very honest about in terms of bias are not
      an issue in this particular case.
 8
          She -- she did note she thinks fraud is bad. Everybody
 9
      thinks fraud is bad. The question is whether we can prove it.
10
11
      She was very clear that she would follow the Court's
      instructions.
12
13
          THE COURT: I think that's right. I'm going to overrule the
      objection.
14
          MR. KEKER: Your Honor, could I be heard again?
15
          THE COURT: Yes. Since I managed to change my mind several
16
17
      times.
          MR. KEKER:
                     Yeah. But I mean, she cannot say -- when she
18
      was asked if she could be fair, she said --
19
          MS. LITTLE: She said no.
20
          MR. KEKER: She said no.
21
                         That was before --
          MR. FRENTZEN:
22
          MR. KEKER: If I could finish, Mr. Frentzen?
23
          When asked on the questionnaire whether or not she could
24
      follow the instructions, she says "I'll do my best but I'm not
25
```

sure."

She goes on: "I'm inclined to be biased against some races from my past experience." A friend -- and who knows where that biases and where it goes. She talks about fraud about three times in this thing.

This woman is not going to be a fair juror. Period. I think it's obvious.

THE COURT: I don't know that that's true. I mean, listen.

If I agreed with you, she would be off. But I don't -- I don't know that she's not going to be fair.

And of course, I don't know the evidence in the case. But
-- and I was -- I was taken, as you were, about her visceral
reaction to the word "fraud." But she works in a bank, doesn't
she? I mean, of course, they all say that, work in a bank, you
know. They hate that.

MR. FRENTZEN: She does, Your Honor. And when Mr. Keker asked her does she believe that fraud has been committed, she said yes. And then when she got an opportunity to clarify, she says "I don't mean your client in this case. I just know that fraud occurs because I'm a banker and I see it happen."

He's -- she did say no initially. Then when the Court asked her, she was very clear that yes, she could be fair. And so for all those reasons -- you know.

And the -- she was candid about having bias in certain phases of life. She said that wasn't going to affect her in

```
this particular case. And, you know, that's true of some of
 1
      these other jurors that we have just read the questionnaire
 2
      where they say they are biased one way or the other in their
 3
      personal life, but if it doesn't have any bearing on this case,
 4
 5
      then we are clearly not excusing those folks, either.
          MR. KEKER: Nobody here in this panel is as bad as she is.
 6
      She is awful.
                     I mean, she said --
 7
          MR. FRENTZEN: Just --
 8
          MR. KEKER: She's a banker who sees fraud everyplace, and
 9
      admits that she's got bias. And, and she is a government --
10
11
          THE COURT: I'm sort of listening to this, and figuring out
      how could I defend whatever position I'm going to take. And I
12
      think I'm going to let her go. She's one of the most outspoken
13
      people in the -- not that that is necessarily bad.
14
15
          Anyway, what number is she?
16
          MR. KEKER: 26, Your Honor.
17
          MR. FRENTZEN: 26. And if I could just note, we object.
      And we think that the issues with the -- you know, in terms of
18
      the biases, that that was true of a number of jurors that the
19
      Court had -- was not granting our motion to excuse in terms of
20
      them indicating that just as clearly in their questionnaires.
21
          THE COURT: Who is that, Mr. Frentzen?
22
          MR. FRENTZEN: 76, and I forget the other one.
23
          THE COURT: Nothing hits me the way Poopat hit me.
24
```

Anyway, let's -- what else? Who else?

```
That's it.
 1
          MR. KEKER:
 2
          THE COURT: So the government has made challenges to three,
      and I've granted one. And the defense has made a challenge to
 3
      four, and I've granted one.
 4
 5
          MR. FRENTZEN:
                         Correct.
          THE COURT: Very even-handed of the Court.
 6
 7
                 I don't know whether -- do you need some more time?
      Because now what happens is I excuse them. They come in, I
 8
      excuse them, but I don't move people. You just look at them and
 9
10
      then you pass the paper back and forth.
11
          MR. FRENTZEN: With them in the courtroom.
          THE COURT: Uh-huh.
12
13
          MR. KEKER: Can we get ten minutes?
          THE COURT: Why not? That may help you.
14
15
          MR. REEVES: Yes.
16
          MR. FRENTZEN: Sure, that would be great.
17
          THE COURT:
                      Why don't you go out and tell them it will be
      another ten minutes, and we will take a break.
18
19
          THE CLERK:
                      Okay.
                      Thank you, Your Honor.
20
          MR. KEKER:
21
          MR. FRENTZEN:
                         Thank you.
          (Recess taken from 2:44 p.m. to 2:58 p.m.)
22
23
          THE CLERK:
                     Come to order.
24
          THE COURT: Bring them in.
25
          THE CLERK: All right.
```

```
(The following proceedings were held in the presence of the
 2
     Jury Venire)
 3
          THE COURT: Are we missing some?
 4
 5
          THE CLERK:
                      No.
          THE COURT: Everybody's here. Okay, have a seat.
 6
 7
          Ladies and gentlemen, again, thank you. We took some extra
      time because we wanted to try to come to some decisions early
 8
      on, which we have done.
 9
          I'm going to read a list of names. If I name your name,
10
11
      even though I may mispronounce it, it means you are excused.
      And you are to go to the Jury Commissioner's office.
12
          And I want to thank you, because obviously you're
13
      indispensable to the process of making the selection.
14
15
          So, some of you will be in an order. Some of you will not.
16
      Not to assume anything by the order. But I have just written a
17
      list at different times. And we'll start.
18
          So, Juror No. 5, Mr. Higgins.
          Juror No. 7 -- you should get up and leave.
19
      idea.
20
          Juror No. 7, Ms. Jameson. Juror No. 8, Ms. Yip. Juror
21
      No. 24, Mr. Aoki.
22
23
          Juror No. 28, Mr. Rowland. Juror No. 29, Ms. Craig.
          Juror No. 30, Mr. Nori -- or Ms. Nori? Ms. Nori.
24
25
      you.
```

```
1
          Juror No. 33, Ms. Barr.
 2
          Juror No. 35, Mr. O'Brien. Juror No. 36, Mr. Woebcke.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR WOEBCKE: Thank you.
 3
                     Sorry. Juror No. 37, Mr. Pressley.
 4
          THE COURT:
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR PRESSLEY: Thank you.
 6
          UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Do we take the numbers?
 7
          THE CLERK: Please leave the numbers behind. Thank you.
          THE COURT: Juror No. 40, Mr. Maganazook.
 8
          Juror No. 48, Mr. Walker. Juror No. 52, Mr. Wong.
 9
          Juror No. 54, Ms. Ling. Juror No. 61, Mr. Stallcup.
10
11
          Juror No. 64, Mr. Pevna.
12
          Juror No. 65, Mr. Doveralba. Juror No. 69, Ms. Maeda.
13
      Juror No. 73, Ms. Palo. Juror No. 75, Mr. Stegeman.
          Juror No. 80, Ms. Bonilla. Juror No. 84, Ms. Sangpo.
14
15
          Juror No. 32, Mr. Antaki. Juror No. 79, Mr. Beaty. Juror
16
      No. 12, Mr. Hall.
17
          Juror No. 2, Ms. Morales. Juror No. 4, Mr. Sayborivong.
      Juror No. 10, Ms. Kaul.
18
19
          Juror No. 14, Ms. Mei. Juror No. 58, Mr. Moy. Juror
20
      No. 60, Ms. Carmona Rios.
21
          UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: She's gone.
22
          THE COURT: Pardon?
23
          UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: She's gone.
          THE COURT: Carmona Rios, she's gone?
24
25
          UNIDENTIFIED MAN: She left when you called the number.
```

```
Juror No. 72, Ms. Resplandor.
 1
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
 2
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPLANDOR: Thank you.
          THE COURT:
                     Juror No. 53, Ms. Combs. Juror No. 26,
 3
      Ms. Poopat.
 4
 5
          Okay. Now I would like to ask the parties: Have I
      identified all those jurors who were challenged for cause?
 6
 7
          Is there anyone that I have missed or misannounced or
      something?
 8
          MR. FRENTZEN: Yes, we agree.
 9
          THE COURT:
                      Okay. I haven't missed anyone.
10
11
          MR. KEKER: One second, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Yeah, go right ahead.
12
13
          MR. KEKER: Thank you, Your Honor. That is what I have.
          THE COURT: Okay. So now we are going to do something
14
15
      called "choreography." I would like the last three people in
16
      the first row to -- the gentleman, Mr. Flournoy, stays where you
17
      are.
          Will you move down, please? And you move down next to the
18
      next person. And then I want the three people in the second row
19
      to move in right in the last three seats, so the next three
20
      seats, in the same order in which you are seated.
21
22
          (Request complied with by the potential jurors)
23
          THE COURT: Then I would like six, the first six, one, two,
      three, four, five, six, just, just go directly to the seat
24
25
      behind you.
```

```
(Request complied by the potential jurors)
 1
          THE COURT: And you also, as well.
 2
          (Request complied with by other potential jurors)
 3
          THE COURT:
                      No, no, no, not the last person. Not -- you.
 4
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL:
                                          Oh.
 6
          THE COURT: Okay, just have a seat. All right. Now, I'm
 7
      not going to move anyone else around right now.
          So are we all comfortable in proceeding? Does this help or
 8
 9
      not?
          MR. REEVES:
                       (Nods head)
10
11
          THE COURT:
                     So do we have the piece of paper?
12
          THE CLERK:
                     Yes.
13
          THE COURT:
                     Now, ladies and gentlemen, you may talk.
      is happening -- not a mystery -- is that a piece of paper is
14
15
      being passed back and forth. And the parties are doing --
16
      making a selection, which they are entitled to do under the law.
17
          And then once that's done, then it's just going to take a
      few minutes, I will excuse the people who are on the list.
18
      then we have a jury.
19
20
          So if you want to talk, talk.
21
          (A pause in the proceedings)
22
          MR. KEKER: Your Honor --
23
          THE COURT:
                     Just don't move.
          MR. KEKER: Could we approach with a question?
24
          THE COURT:
25
                      Yeah.
```

```
1
         MR. KEKER:
                     Your Honor, can we see you at sidebar? Doesn't
     need to be on the record.
 2
          THE COURT: Sure.
 3
          (Sidebar discussion held off the Record)
 4
 5
          THE COURT: Okay.
          (Document handed up to the Court)
 6
 7
          THE COURT: Okay. So, I am going to read off actually 16
     names. Not any particular order. But if I read your name, um,
 8
     you have been asked to leave, not serve. So please go to the
 9
     Jury Commissioner's office.
10
11
         And once again, you have our appreciation for your services.
         Okay. Juror No. 38, Ms. Lopez Morillas -- or Mister,
12
13
     Mister. I'm sorry, excuse me. You are the person.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOPEZ-MORILLAS: Thank you.
14
15
         THE COURT: Thank you. Juror No. 3, Mr. Ho. Juror No. 62,
16
     Mr. Naeseth.
          Juror No. 27, Ms. Cranley. Juror No. 34, Mr. Middleton.
17
     Juror No. 63, Mr. Angel.
18
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANGEL: Thank you.
19
          THE COURT: Juror No. 7, Ms. Kiziryan. Is that right? Have
20
      I said it right?
21
22
         MR. FRENTZEN: 47, Your Honor.
23
         UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN:
          THE COURT: Wait, wait, 45.
24
25
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR KIZIRYAN: Kiziryan? Thank you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: Who just left? Did I excuse the right person?
Somebody just walked out. I hope it was the right one. Now
it's Juror No. 45, Kiziryan. And I'm sorry for mispronouncing
your name.
   PROSPECTIVE JUROR KIZIRYAN: Thank you.
    THE COURT: Juror No. 46, Ms. Plevyak.
   PROSPECTIVE JUROR PLEVYAK: Yes.
   THE COURT: Juror No. 90 -- pardon me.
   Juror No. 44, Ms. Shay?
   Do I have that right?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHAY: Yes.
   THE COURT: All right. Juror No. 22, Ms. Floresjovel.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR FLORESJOVEL: Thank you.
    THE COURT: Juror No. 6, Mr. Weiner. Juror No. 25,
              Juror No. 20, Mister -- Mr. Schumann?
Mr. Johnston.
   PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHUMANN:
                                Schumann.
   THE COURT: Schumann, beg your pardon. Can't read my
writing.
         Pardon me.
    Juror No. 11, Mr. Wong. Or Ms. Wong. Ms. Wong. Pardon me.
Juror No. 76 -- well, yes, Ms. Hernandez Soto or
Mr. Hernandez Soto, pardon me. Thank you. Juror No. 42,
Mr. Conroy.
   Okay. So the three people in the first top row, please move
over. And I would like the first three people in the second row
to join the people in the back row. In the same order.
```

```
Go around, sir. Yeah, go around. Go the long way.
 1
 2
     worry about the papers.
         And I would like the two people here to move down. And then
 3
      I would like -- now I'm looking out at the audience -- the young
 4
 5
      lady in pink, or in gray, to come up. And take your seat.
 6
         And then I would like you to come up as well (Indicating).
     And sir, I would like you to come up.
 7
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR RULLAMAS: This seat?
 8
          THE COURT: No, front row. That row. That row.
                                                            That's
 9
     right. Appreciate it. Okay, now I can't tell, lack of depth
10
11
     perception. Is it the gentleman on the -- towards the wall or
     the other gentleman?
12
          I think this gentleman's next, right?
13
         THE CLERK: Number --
14
         THE COURT: Okay, now. And you join them. Thank you.
15
16
     Okay.
17
         Now, my question to the parties is: Is this the jury?
         MR. LEACH: Yes, Your Honor.
18
19
         MR. KEKER: Yes, Your Honor.
          THE COURT:
                     Okay. So, we will now proceed to alternates.
20
          THE CLERK:
21
                     Okay.
22
          THE COURT: Everybody just stay where you are.
23
          (A pause in the proceedings)
         MR. KEKER: I think we're done, Your Honor.
24
25
          (Document handed up to the Courtroom Deputy)
```

```
(Document handed up to the Court)
 1
 2
          THE COURT: How many, how many people do we have out there?
      What's the number?
 3
          Could you raise your hand if your name hasn't been called
 4
 5
      yet? I just want to get a number, a count. One, two, three --
      one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten,
 6
      eleven, twelve.
 7
          Let me see the parties at sidebar.
 8
          (Sidebar discussion held off the Record)
 9
          THE COURT: Okay. Would you give this back to -- just be a
10
11
      moment.
               Just be a moment.
          (Document handed down)
12
13
          THE CLERK: Who do you want me to --
          THE COURT: Government.
14
15
          THE CLERK: Okay.
16
          (A pause in the proceedings)
17
          MR. KEKER: So we're doing it.
          THE COURT: I thought so.
18
19
          MR. KEKER:
                      Okay, great.
                         I thought so too.
20
          MR. FRENTZEN:
21
          THE COURT:
                     One more.
22
          (A pause in the proceedings)
23
          (Document handed up to the Courtroom Deputy)
24
          THE CLERK: Thank you.
25
          (Document handed up to the Court)
```

```
(The Court examines document)
 1
 2
          THE COURT: Okay. If I call your name now, you are excused
      as well, with the Court's thanks.
 3
          Juror No. 78, Mr. Miller. Juror No. 55, Ms. McClellon.
 4
 5
     Mr. McClellon. Pardon me.
          Juror No. 81, Mister -- is it Munguia? Right.
 6
 7
          Juror No. 68, Ms. Encarnacio. Is that right?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR ENCARNACIO: Encarnacio.
 8
 9
          THE COURT: I'm sorry, yes, thank you. Juror No. 85,
     Ms. Drake.
10
11
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR DRAKE: Thank you.
         THE COURT: Juror No. 86, Mr. Ramaswamy.
12
13
         Okay. Now, let's start moving people.
         Who's in the first row? Sir. Come on up. Take the last
14
15
      seat in the first -- in the second row. Right at the top.
16
         And now we'll have you take the seat right in front of that.
         And I think -- are you next? Yes. Please come up.
17
      the seat right here. Right here. Real close.
18
         Next, and next, and next.
19
          (Requests complied with by the potential alternate jurors)
20
          THE COURT: Okay, do we all agree these are the alternates?
21
         MR. FRENTZEN: Yes, Your Honor.
22
23
         MR. KEKER: Yes, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: And we're out of people. Amazing. Amazing.
24
25
     Okay, so I am going to swear in the jury. And go ahead, swear
```

```
in the -- first, just the --
 1
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: If I may -- I think I have said
 2
      it before -- I won't be here on February 26th.
 3
          THE COURT:
                     Pardon me?
 4
 5
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: I will not be in the country on
      February 26. If that's the start of the trial, I won't be here.
 6
 7
          THE COURT: I'm sorry; were we aware of this issue?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: I said it earlier.
 8
          THE COURT: And may I inquire as to why you won't be here?
 9
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: I will be on vacation. I will
10
11
      be coming back from vacation on that day.
          THE COURT: What number are you?
12
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY:
13
          THE COURT: Well, you are a trial attorney, is that right?
14
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY: Yes.
15
16
          THE COURT: All right, I'm going to swear you in at this
      point anyway, and we will have to deal with that.
17
          So, swear in first the jury. Or do you swear them all in at
18
      the same time, can you do that? I think you can.
19
          THE CLERK: I think I can.
20
          THE COURT: Okay.
21
22
          THE CLERK: Yes.
23
          THE COURT: All 16 of you rise, please.
          THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
24
          THE COURT: Eighteen, 18. Yeah.
25
```

(Jury Panel and alternates sworn in)

THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.

THE COURT: Well, congratulations. I don't know whether they're in order or not. You all don't look all that happy.

But, I will tell you that we are -- all, all of us in this room are so appreciative of your service.

I want to take maybe five minutes and explain something to you which I think is of key importance for the period of time that you serve on the jury. It discusses your conduct as jurors. And let me read this to you because I think it's essential that you appreciate what I'm about to say.

First, keep an open mind throughout the trial and do not decide what the verdict should be until you and your fellow jurors have completed your deliberations at the end of the case.

Second, because you must decide this case based only on the evidence received in the case and on my instructions as to the law that applies, you must not be exposed to any other information about the case, or to the issues it involves during the course of your jury duty.

Thus, until the end of the case or unless I tell you otherwise, do not communicate with anyone in any way, and do not let anyone else communicate with you in any way about the merits of the case, in person, in writing, by phone or electronic means. Be it email, text messaging or any internet chatroom, blog, website or other feature. This applies to communicating

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

16

18

21

24

25

with your fellow jurors, until I give you the case for deliberation. And it applies to communicating with everyone else, including your family members, your employer, the media or press, and the people involved in the trial. Although, you may notify your family, your employer, friends, that you have been seated as a juror in this case. But if you are asked or approached in any way about your jury service or anything about this case, you must respond that you have been ordered not to discuss the matter, and to report the 10 contact to the Court. So let me give you what I call "practical advice." 11 Obviously, there are people in your family, your friends, maybe your employer, your kids and so forth who know you are here today, and they will say: Gee, hey, what happened? 14 15 And you can say: I was selected to be on a jury. Oh. Oh, what kind of case is it? 17 And you could say: It's criminal. And then they'll say: Criminal. What's it about? That's the line. And all you say to that is: 19 Aha. sorry -- if you want to say that, depending on your relationship 20 with them -- but the judge ordered me not to discuss the case until it's over. 22 When it's over, you can talk to anybody who will listen 23

about anything involved in the case. Anything at all. I don't

care. No, there will be no restrictions on you, whatsoever.

But until the case is given to you for decision, you are not to discuss the case.

And it's a very slippery slope. Because once you say:
Well, you know, it has to do with accounting, or: Well, it has
to do with Hewlett-Packard, or Autonomy, or this or that,
somebody will give you an opinion.

And you know what? That opinion won't be based on evidence.

It will either be based on something they read somewhere, or
they made it up. Or they heard it somewhere.

And when I said at the outset that this is one of the most important things you can do as a citizen, what makes it important is that at the end of the process, you have confidence that 11 people agreed with you, if you're able to arrive at an agreement. It's called the integrity of the verdict. It's the integrity of your process. To spend a month or two months in a waste of time is really unfortunate for you, and for everybody else in this courtroom. And for the public at large. It would be a waste.

And so I would say to you: Do not -- do not do anything to jeopardize the integrity of your verdict. That includes, of course, going on emails, looking at Google, researching it, all of those things.

I guarantee you, it may not be apparent, but I will tell you a secret. These lawyers are not shy. You might think they are very shy, but they're not. And actually, they are very

accomplished. And they will present to you any information and all the information they can gather that they think is relevant, is important to your decision. So you won't be -- you won't -- you won't wonder: Gee, if the lawyers thought it was important, I didn't get it, so I have to get it off the internet or some other source.

The answer is no. They're very competent. Highly competent. And they want you to decide this case, based upon the evidence presented to you.

And I think you owe it to them, you owe it to the system, and you owe it to each other and to yourselves to make sure that the time you are about to spend in what is one of the most important things you can do in our system today, is fair, impartial, and the appropriate result.

And so I tell you again: Please, please, do not do any research; do not talk about the case.

The law requires these restrictions to ensure the parties have a fair trial, based on the same evidence that each party has had an opportunity to address. A juror who violates these restrictions jeopardizes the fairness of these proceedings. And a mistrial could result.

If any juror is exposed to outside information, please notify the Court immediately. You notify Ms. Scott. She is your guardian angel. She will get to meet you, you will get to know her. She's very approachable. And she is the arm of the

```
She is how communications take place. And so any
 1
      Court.
      concerns that you have, raise them with Ms. Scott.
 2
          So, again, I want to thank you. And I want to -- now it's
 3
            Apologies to the Sebastopol contingent, if we have any,
 4
 5
      the survivors of that. Gotta drive all alone. But, I want to
      -- I again really thank you for your service.
 6
          You are going to go back into the jury room now.
 7
                                                            I assume
      that over some period of time, we might have larger
 8
      accommodations for you, but right now just go back in that room,
 9
      and Ms. Scott will discuss matters with you. Thank you.
10
                                                                 Take
11
      everything.
          Oh, yes, let me say just one other thing before you go. I'm
12
      going to give you a list of dates that I'm quite sure we won't
13
      be meeting, so you can make some plans around those. Some
14
15
      change, but I'm hopeful that they are days that you can count
16
      on, not being here. So you can make those plans. Okay.
17
          THE CLERK:
                      Okay.
          THE COURT:
                      Thank you.
18
          And I'll deal with your problem. I want to discuss it with
19
20
      the lawyers.
21
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR SCHEFFY:
                                      Okay.
          (Jury excused)
22
23
          (The following proceedings were held outside of the
     presence of the Jury)
24
          THE COURT: Let the record reflect the jurors have left.
25
```

```
So, what do we want to do about the trial lawyer who is
 1
      coming back one day short on her vacation?
 2
          MR. KEKER: She said in her questionnaire she had a trial
 3
      February 13th. She's never mentioned anything about a vacation.
 4
 5
      But I don't have any objections, since she is the last
      alternate, to excuse her.
 6
                     I do. I mean, I really have a fundamental --
 7
          THE COURT:
      you know, I -- I would listen -- I've done this now for 23
 8
              I listen to people who are lawyers and mediators saying:
 9
      You know, Judge, I don't think I can be fair.
10
11
          You know, you know. And you want to take something and
      throw it at them. I mean, their job is to be fair, their
12
      professional job is to be fair, and they tell me they can't be
13
      fair because all they want to do is get out of jury duty.
14
          I'm sorry she's got a vacation that will be cut one day
15
16
      short.
17
          Where does she -- where does she practice?
          MR. FRENTZEN: Your Honor --
18
          THE COURT:
                     Anybody know?
19
          MR. KEKER:
                     (Inaudible)
20
          MR. REEVES: Hawkins.
21
                         We do. It was on the questionnaire
22
          MR. FRENTZEN:
23
      Your Honor.
                   I think it's like an employment law --
                       Hawkins Parnell Thackston and Young, 5.5 years,
24
          MS. LITTLE:
25
      defense employment law attorney. And she says --
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
She will hate me. I don't think she's going to
    THE COURT:
hate you, but I don't care if they hate me or not. But, you
know, again, on the one hand, I don't like people serving on a
jury who shouldn't serve, who don't want to be on the jury.
   But, I also have -- maybe you all ought to sleep on this,
let her sleep too. I think it would be better off if we meet
tomorrow and go over the motions in limine and so forth. Fresh
       Everybody is pretty tired.
   MR. FRENTZEN: That's fine with the government, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Is that okay?
              What time, Your Honor? 10:00?
   MR. KEKER:
   THE COURT: Yeah, 10:00 sounds good. Is that good for you?
   MR. FRENTZEN: Sounds good.
   MR. KEKER: Bankers' hours.
   THE COURT: Yeah, bankers' hours. Bankers' hours.
you. I just didn't see -- I mean, I know that you all think
that it was the persuasive effect of Mr. Keker's brief that
convinced me, but actually, I hadn't read it before I decided to
change my mind once again, because my idea was, well, I'll bring
back, you know, four people, which seems sort of: What's the
point?
   MR. FRENTZEN:
                  Your Honor --
    THE COURT: What would that have accomplished?
   MR. FRENTZEN: Our concern is a little larger than that.
It's, you know -- but --
```

```
Let's say we're missing people. Then you have
 1
          THE COURT:
      to make a judgment at that point what to do.
 2
         MR. FRENTZEN: What's done is done. We're there. And so,
 3
     we're just going to roll on with it, Your Honor. And hope we
 4
 5
     get a full jury.
          THE COURT: See that attitude? I want you to pick that one
 6
     up. That's great. What's done is done.
 7
         MR. FRENTZEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
          THE COURT: What's done is done. Okay. Thanks so much.
 9
         MR. KEKER: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
11
          THE COURT: You all got a copy of this (Indicating). If you
     think it's wrong or something let me know -- it's, so, it's for
12
13
     planning purposes. And I'll see you tomorrow. And we'll just
     go through them, it won't take too long.
14
15
         Yes, Mr. Reeves.
16
         MR. REEVES:
                      Thank Your Honor. Was that the schedule you
17
     were holding?
18
          THE COURT: No, these are days off.
         MR. REEVES: Yes, I --
19
20
          THE COURT: I gave it to you.
21
         MR. REEVES: I do have it, yeah.
22
          THE COURT: Days off, so you've got witnesses, you've got
```

planning, and this is an opportunity to get your ducks in order

MR. REEVES: Thank Your Honor.

before we start the trial.

23

24

```
I think we're okay. Okay.
 1
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
                                                            Thanks.
          MR. FRENTZEN: See you in the morning, Your Honor.
 2
 3
          MR. LEACH:
                      Thank you.
 4
          MR. REEVES: Good night, thank you.
          (Proceedings concluded)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, BELLE BALL, Official Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. BelliBall /s/ Belle Ball Belle Ball, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR Friday, February 23, 2018